

IN THE TIME OF JESUS

SEIDEL



DS 122 .S44 1885  
Seidel, Martin.  
In the time of Jesus







# IN THE TIME OF JESUS :

## HISTORICAL PICTURES

BY

MARTIN ✓ SEIDEL, D.D.

---

New York :

ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO.,

900, BROADWAY.



## PREFACE.

---

A CLEAR understanding of the New Testament Scriptures seems hardly possible without a knowledge of the circumstances and conditions of the times in which Jesus and his Apostles lived. The many excellent works, called Histories of New Testament Times—such as those of Schneckenburger, Schuerer, Hausrath, and others, to say nothing of other books bearing on the subject—are of great assistance for the attainment of that knowledge.

While, however, the first-named is in some respects superseded; the second, most elaborate and comprehensive; and the last, adapted chiefly for theologians, this little work attempts for the first time to present a plain delineation of the time of Jesus, founded on known and apposite facts, and comprised within brief limits.

To whom will this concise picture be of use? It will certainly not render superfluous the reading of other and larger works on the same subject; rather, will it prepare the way for them, and, it is hoped, do some little also on its own part, in contributing to a better understanding in our day of that world in which Our Lord lived.

The Author hopes that the book may be especially useful to students of theology, in serving as an introduction to a more complete and exhaustive investigation of the subject ; also to his brethren in the sacred office, in presenting a brief comprehensive survey of the conditions and relations of those times ; and, further, to teachers in schools, as a hand-book of Bible study. He trusts, too, that it will be acceptable to many Christian readers, in helping them to an insight into the state of the world in the days of the Master, and increasing the interest and love with which they read the records of his life.

The book has certainly not been written without love for the subject. May it meet with the same interest on the part of the reader.

That it may furnish some true stones for the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God, is the heartfelt prayer of the Author,

MARTIN SEIDEL.

To the above brief preface I need only add one or two words as the English translator.

My earnest endeavour has been simply to make the able and erudite author say in English what he says in German, only adding a word or two of my own in a very

few instances, when it seemed absolutely necessary for English readers.

I have taken great pains to avoid even slight errors, and to make the book in its English form an accurate and reliable one.

This has, however, been to me a labour full of the deepest and most sacred interest ; and if, as I hope, the book only awakens the same feeling in its readers, I shall be content.

February, 1885.

W. E. M.





## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION ... ..	1

### PART I.

#### THE HEATHEN WORLD.

I. THE UNION OF PEOPLES IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE ...	10
II. RELIGIOUS LIFE IN THE HEATHEN WORLD ...	17
III. THE STATE OF MORALS AMONG THE GENTILES ...	32

### PART II.

#### THE JEWISH WORLD.

I. THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL ...	94
II. THE POLITICAL GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE ...	68
III. THE SANHEDRIN AND THE HIGH PRIESTS ...	91
IV. THE SCRIBES ... ..	98
V. RELIGIOUS LIFE AMONG THE JEWS ...	112
VI. PARTIES AMONG THE JEWS ... ..	128
VII. THE MESSIANIC HOPE ... ..	147
VIII. JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION ... ..	163

### APPENDIX.

I. NOTES ... ..	i
II. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE ... ..	x
III. INDEX ... ..	xv





# IN THE TIME OF JESUS.

---

## INTRODUCTORY.

THE following pages are intended to present a view of the actual state of the world in the time of Jesus. It is always interesting to realize to our own minds the condition of things in the days of great statesmen, poets, and philosophers of ancient or modern times. Not only does it bring more clearly into view the mental and moral characteristics—the thoughts, dispositions, and actions of the great men themselves, but it throws light also on many of the circumstances and ideas of our own day.

But how much more interest must it awaken to obtain some clear views of the state of affairs in His day whose appearance marks the turning point in the whole history of the world, and divides the New World from the Old—He who exercised the greatest possible influence, not only on the course of external events, but also on the moral and spiritual life of humanity—yea, He who by His word and life, His death and resurrection, brought to the world that which millions of our race in all previous ages had longed for—the redemption of the soul?

But, it may be said, are not the descriptions and narratives of the New Testament sufficient to enable us to form a tolerably complete picture of the external circumstances and conditions of the life of Jesus? Undoubtedly all that, for our salvation, it is indispensably necessary for us to know, is therein made evident to the simplest mind. We must remember, however, that nearly two thousand years separate our time from that in which the occurrences narrated in the New Testament took place; also that not only the political and social conditions of the period, but the circumstances of individuals, were very different from those of our own day; and then it will be evident that without a searching explication of the facts, it is impossible for us to understand the state of things in that world in which Jesus lived.

Moreover, that such knowledge is an essential help to a more thorough understanding of the New Testament Scriptures is beyond doubt. It is true that Biblical commentators, in explaining the Scriptures verse by verse, give the requisite illustrations, drawn from the facts and circumstances of the times in which they were written; but these are often necessarily very brief and scanty, and are scattered here and there in bulky volumes. This little book, on the contrary—following the example of larger works on the same subject—attempts to bring before the mind the time of Jesus in its continuity and completeness; and thereby to throw a clear light on many passages of the New Testament bearing on the circumstances of the period. Thus it will do its part it is hoped in promoting Scriptural knowledge.

While however the following delineations seek to increase our knowledge of New Testament times, they may also serve to occupy us more with the Scriptures themselves, and thus to awaken a constantly growing interest in the Sacred Records, an interest which in these days of increasing devotion to material things is in danger of waning.

And further ; if we take a thoughtful survey of the state of the world when Jesus came, as it is here depicted, we cannot help seeing how both in Judaism and heathenism "*the fulness of the time*" was come. The state of each of them makes it evident that the mission of the ancient peoples was accomplished ; that a desire and longing for a new and better state of things was thrilling all hearts ; and that expectation was directed to the appearance of a Saviour in the east who should give peace to peace-seeking souls. Every one who considers attentively the signs of that time will be involuntarily led to Him who has indeed brought all that humanity longed for ; and thus our unvarnished sketch will unconsciously become an eloquent vindication of Christianity.

But of course we must not understand the expression, "the time of Jesus," in too narrow a sense, as if we had only to bring before the mind what can be found within the few years of his earthly life. The slender reports which we possess of that period would forbid such a limitation of our view ; and also the consideration that then we should only be able to ascertain isolated facts without regard to their origin and effect, thus making our picture superficial and obscure. Rather must we look not only to the time of Christ's actual life, but to that immediately

preceding and following it, if our plain description is to be satisfactory. And, for the same reason, it seems to us to be necessary not only to paint the condition of the country and the people in whose midst Jesus lived, but—since he is not the representative of any nation or race, but the head of all mankind—to describe the actual state of the world as it was then known, and as it stands related with the New Testament history. We shall begin with some account of the vast Roman empire which at that time embraced almost the entire circle of the earth, and then proceed to the special consideration of the state of the Jewish people of whom our Lord was born. Thus it will be apparent to all that to write a “Life of Jesus” is not our object; that is a subject which must be left for separate and special treatment.

If it is asked why we have chosen for our title “the time of Jesus,” rather than “of Christ,” the answer is that we have chiefly to do with a historical and not a doctrinal personage; although it is our hope that the reader will hold fast to the faith, and be strengthened in it, that Jesus is the Saviour of the World.

But, it may be said, is the historical character of Christ's life conceded? In answer to this question, it is sufficient to say here that sceptical critics, like Strauss and others equally able and learned, have not succeeded in explaining away as myth and legend his historical existence; that in the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament—although not in others of Apocryphal character, which contain much that is fabulous and legendary—we have authentic narratives from the pens of those who stood nearest to him, derived either from their

own personal observations or from the conscientious use of already existing records written by eye-witnesses (Luke i. 1—4); that the existence and triumph of the Christian religion is a living and satisfying proof, since without an author and founder it would be incomprehensible; and, that Jewish and Pagan writers of the first Christian century, or only a little later, are by no means silent about the Christian Church and her founder, it being evident from the writings of Tacitus,<sup>1</sup> Suetonius,<sup>2</sup> Pliny,<sup>3</sup> and others that “the Christian party” and its originator were, at the end of the first century, well known in the heathen parts of the Roman empire; while as regards Judaism, although the dogmatist Philo<sup>4</sup> nowhere expresses his mind about Jesus, Josephus<sup>5</sup> on the other hand, in his Jewish antiquities, writes explicitly of his life and work and death.<sup>6</sup>

Another preliminary question is, how are we to ascertain the dates of the period at which Jesus lived, and which we have to bring before the reader’s mind? Luke states that Jesus was born in the time of Cæsar Augustus Octavianus (Luke ii. 1); Matthew tells us that it was “in the days of Herod the Great” (Matt. ii. 1); and Josephus says that Jesus was put to death under Pontius Pilate.<sup>7</sup> If we enquire more closely after the date of the birth of Jesus, we shall first of all have to give up the chronology of Abbot Dionysius Exiguus, of the sixth century, which is still followed in our calendar, and according to which Jesus was born in the seven hundred and fifty-fourth year from the foundation of the city of Rome; since all research has shown that the date must be put back some few years before 754.

The account of the 'taxing' under Cyrenius, or Quirinius,<sup>8</sup> affords no assistance in determining the required date, because of the irreconcilable difference between the data of 'profane' authors and the statement of the Evangelist on the subject. Various considerations point to the conclusion that this 'taxing' did not take place till about the year 6-7 of our chronology, that is at the time when Augustus, after the deposition of Archelaus, had sent Coponius to be procurator in Judea, and Sulpicius Quirinus to be the new governor of Syria.<sup>9</sup>

Some have thought that the year of the birth of Jesus might be calculated from the narrative of the appearance of the 'star' to the Magi<sup>10</sup> with a greater approach to certainty than from the account of the 'taxing.' It is however much to be regretted that the exact nature of the phenomenon is not known. Still, as a matter of fact, some astronomers have undertaken the task of discovering what it was and when it appeared. The great Kepler was of opinion that it is to be identified with a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, which took place in the year 747 (A.U.C.—that is, from the foundation of the city of Rome); and as the narrative of the massacre of the children in Bethlehem plainly implies that the Magi, who must have arrived in Jerusalem soon after the birth of Jesus, had first seen the "star" some time before when they were in their own country, it is thought probable that the required date may be the year 748 A.U.C. And this is rendered the more probable by the fact that the accession of Mars to the planetary conjunction, which according to Kepler, took place in the spring of that year, must have aroused the greatest attention and interest among

the sages of the east. Others hold that the "star" was a comet, which according to Chinese astronomical tables, was visible for more than two months in the year 750, and they consider that the year in which Jesus was born.<sup>11</sup>

With a closer approach to accuracy we can determine the period sought for by a reference to several important statements in the New Testament. Both Matthew (ch. ii. 1) and Luke (i. 5) point out that Jesus was born before the death of Herod the Great. This took place in the year 750 (that is, 4 B.C. of our chronology) and between the occurrence of an eclipse of the moon,<sup>12</sup> which, according to astronomical calculation was on the 12-13th of March, and the feast of the passover of that year<sup>13</sup>—thus about the end of March or the beginning of April. Now since Herod lived to see the birth of Jesus, and died soon afterwards, it may have taken place a little before or after the beginning of the year 750.

And further; Luke tells us (ch. iii. 1) that John the Baptist entered on his public work in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius and under the procurator Pontius Pilate. Augustus died on the 19th of August, 767, and the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, his successor, would thus be from about the end of August, 781, to the same period in 782. But Tiberius was co-regent during the last two years of the life of Augustus,<sup>14</sup> that is from 765 to 767, and it is very probable that St. Luke may have reckoned the fifteenth year of his reign from the commencement of his regency. If so, the fifteenth year would be 779-80. In that year Jesus was baptized and entered upon his public work. He was then (Luke iii. 23) thirty years old, and the year of his birth would thus be 750.

Again, on the occasion of his purifying the temple,



which occurred at the first passover after his baptism, Jesus was told that the temple had been forty-six years in building (John ii. 20). Now we know that Herod had begun to build it in the eighteenth year of his reign.<sup>15</sup> He came to the throne in the year 717, and thus the eighteenth year of his reign would be 734, and the forty-sixth of the temple building 780. As Jesus was thirty years old in the latter year (Luke iii. 23) this would again give 750 as the year of his birth.

Another calculation is founded on the statement that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, was of the order of priests called "Abia."<sup>16</sup> This was the eighth of the twenty-four classes, or 'courses,' of priests who performed the temple services<sup>17</sup> in regular rotation, each class taking the duties for one week at a time. Now we know from the Talmud<sup>18</sup> that the temple was destroyed A.D. 70, on the 9th of the month Ab (which is about equal to our August), and that the class of priests then in waiting was that called Jehoiarib. Reckoning from that fact it is ascertained that the 'course' of Abia was on duty in the temple from the 3rd to the 9th of October, 748. Nine months later John was born, and as Jesus was six months younger (Luke i. 26) this gives the end of the year 749 or the beginning of 750 as the time of his birth, that is, four years before what we have received as the beginning of the Christian era.<sup>19</sup> With this comparatively close definition of the period we must be content.

With regard to the date of the *day* on which Jesus was born, our knowledge is much less certain. The Eastern Church celebrates January the 6th (our Epiphany) as Christmas day, but this day—it is thought—was chosen from a desire to establish a parallel between



the birth of the first Adam on the sixth day of the great week of creation and the birth of Jesus on the same day of the first week of the Christian era. The West, on the other hand, since the time of the Romish bishop Liberius in the fourth century, observes the 25th of December as the day of the birth of Jesus. But this is based on the reckoning of nine months from the 25th of March, which is assumed without proof to be the day of the Annunciation to the Virgin Mary. It is also probable that the observance of Christmas at this season of the year was at first connected with the Roman festival of Saturn, and that by degrees the heathen festival was overcome and transformed into the Christian one. It is not possible to say anything more definite as to the day of Christ's birth, especially when we remember that other days than those named have been fixed upon, almost every day in the year indeed.

Finally, as regards the time when Jesus died, if we keep in view the fact that he was thirty years of age when he began his public work, and that in that ministry we can count, according to the Evangelist John (John ii. 13, vi. 4, xiii. 1), three passover festivals, at the last of which he was crucified, we may assume that he only lived to be about thirty-three years old. But here also opinions vary, and absolute accuracy cannot be attained. But the exact determination of dates is not necessary for our purpose, since we know with approximate certainty at what time and in what years Jesus lived.

What image may we form of that time? What was the aspect of affairs in heathendom and Judaism—in the Roman empire generally, and in Palestine?

## PART FIRST.

---

*The Heathen World.*

## I.

## THE UNION OF PEOPLES IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

THE statement by St. Luke that "there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed" leads us at once into the midst of that universal empire, the centre of which was in Rome.

The old world had decayed. The great kingdoms of the east—Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Egyptian—all had passed away. True it is, Alexander the Macedonian had endeavoured to realize his idea of a world-wide empire that should unite the whole East with Greece, but his vast dominion had broken up into separate kingdoms under his successors, and had finally fallen to the Roman empire.

Rome ruled over almost all the known world, and with justice has it been called<sup>20</sup> "the aggregating power of antiquity, the centre in which all the threads of ancient life were gathered together." "The fusion of all existing national elements, and the recasting of them into one

form that should exhibit all the life that had been so far developed—that was the mission and the work of Rome in the history of the world. She stands before us as the vessel into which all the elements of previous stages of life were poured in order, as far as was possible to the spirit of antiquity, to form humanity into one body.” Her dominion covered almost the entire arena of ancient history. The Roman eagles were planted on the banks of the Euphrates in the east ; Egypt, and the whole northern coast of Africa obeyed them on the south ; and from the pillars of Hercules on the southern border of Spain to the German provinces in the north, all the peoples were subject to Rome.

The empire was now at the height of its power. The battle of Actium (31 B.C.) had given an emperor, and thus an ideal centre of unity, to the powerful empire which embraced the whole civilized world. It was however, among other causes, the long peace which prevailed under Octavius that brought the small detached nations nearer to each other in the politically united empire. The Romans, the people of action, of valour, of war, and of statesman-like wisdom, now sought their glory not so much in the winning of battles as in the completion of the empire ; more in organization than in conquest, and more in building up than in destruction. For commerce in particular very great things were done by them. They made roads and built bridges which linked the countries together ; and erected walls and castles to protect the work accomplished. Thus well-made highways extended through the whole empire ; posts at regular intervals brought news from the provinces ; and at definite dis-

tances travellers found inns or stage-buildings where horses were changed and in which rest and refreshment could be had. One great road ran from Gades in Spain through France into Italy; from thence, to say nothing of waterways, there were roads into Greece which were carried on beyond the Mediterranean sea and into Asia. In the provinces of Egypt and the countries of the Danube there were also great highways. The imperial troops could advance rapidly over these roads; the messengers could convey their despatches with great expedition to Rome, or from thence into the provinces; and the people who were travelling for pleasure could reach their destination with proportionate ease and comfort. At the same time, by reason of the security which was more and more attained, there arose, as never before, an active commerce by land and water between the now united peoples. All nationalities were brought into acquaintance and communication with each other in the one empire, and little territories were no longer divided by strictly guarded frontiers. And thus not only material products, the good things of the external life, but the higher treasures of the mind also were now distributed and became the common good of the many. For the same reason was it possible for the preachers of the gospel to journey through the countries with comparative ease and rapidity, and to spread abroad the message of Christ.

And if, especially in the east of the empire, some countries had still the semblance of independence—if their princes stood in the relation of so-called alliance with Rome—and if, moreover, particular colonies possessed certain privileges—all were at the same time well

aware that they were, in fact, subject to the supreme power, and that all their legitimate and distinctive rights were always dependent on Rome. Save in the few countries which were thus exceptionally dealt with, however, the provinces were under the immediate rule of Roman officials as regards justice and finance and all matters of administration. This sovereignty of Rome, and the operation of Roman law which was more or less valid above local or provincial laws, if it was sometimes the cause of bitterly-felt oppression in particular countries—especially as regards the often extraordinary high taxes and customs—was another powerful influence which tended to draw separate peoples nearer together. But the most important means to general intellectual intercourse was the spread of the Greek language in the Roman empire. It is true the Latin was the language of law, of justice, and of the soldiery; and where numerous castles were erected and colonies established, mostly peopled with veteran and retired soldiers, Latin idioms mingled with the rude speech of the country and at last prevailed generally, as was the case in the provinces now called Spain and France. But in the eastern half of the empire the Latin came into conflict with the more developed Greek language and culture, and could not supplant both. Especially since the time of Alexander the Great's march into Asia and the formation of the Macedonian kingdoms, the Greek language had prevailed more and more throughout the east. Under the Seleucids it had come into common use in Syria, Phenicia, and even in the cities of the Euphrates and Tigris. In Palestine, next to the language of the country, a knowledge of Greek

was indispensable ; and at Alexandria in Egypt acquaintance with Greek literature, science and art, was of the greatest importance. At Rome itself to be able to speak Greek, and to acquire Greek culture, was considered necessary and essential, not only for a more refined existence but for intercourse with Greek-speaking fellow-subjects. Thus the language attained ever-increasing currency, and was—not only in the circles of the most cultivated, but as the language of the world and of commerce—as well, or even better, known than the French or English is to-day. Cælius Aristides could therefore with justice say of the Greeks :—"They celebrate a far greater triumph than that on the field of Marathon in the victory of their language. All states and all races of men have yielded to the spread of our speech and our way of life. It does not stop at the pillars of Hercules, and neither the Libyan desert, nor the Bosphorian straits, nor the narrow defiles of Syria and Cilicia have set limit to it ; but, as if by Divine providence, an ardent desire for our wisdom and civilization has seized on all the world. Our language is now generally recognized as the common one, and through it the whole earth is become intelligible in the same utterance."<sup>21</sup> And, above all, was it not in this same language which united the peoples, that the Missionaries of the Cross, St. Paul for example, were so easily understood when preaching the Gospel, whether in Asia Minor, in Athens, or in Rome ?

The city of Rome was the heart of the world-wide empire, and even such important places as Alexandria, Antioch, or Corinth, were far inferior to it. Rome was, as it has often been said, the meeting-place of the world,



and its inhabitants a community formed by a union of peoples. In this city people of all nations flocked together, and every variety of costume was to be seen in its streets. Hither repaired the cultivated Greek, the Alexandrian merchant, and the Jewish trader ; here the black African and the sun-burnt Asiatic met together with the fair-skinned European. Warehouses, shops, and custom-houses were filled with the rarest products of distant lands, and the most splendid works of the art industries and handicrafts of all nations. "In Rome," said Pliny, "the goods of the whole world could be examined close at hand."<sup>22</sup> In the summer and autumn, merchant ships arrived from all lands, bringing cargoes of wool, silk, and linen from Alexandria ; wine and oysters from the Grecian islands ; fish from the Black Sea ; medicinal herbs from Africa ; spices from Arabia ; garments and jewels from Babylon. From the farthest borders of the empire intelligence was continually brought to Rome. Foreign artists here exhibited their works, and poets and orators discoursed in public. It was as if the whole world were concentrated in Rome.

Out of Rome, on the other hand, there was a constant stream of travel to the farthest provinces ; the troops marched to their stations ; the imperial functionaries set out for their spheres of duty ; pleasure-seekers for favourite places of resort in remote regions ; and merchants returning from the imperial city to their native places communicated to their neighbours and friends the latest news, and thus helped to maintain the union of their country with the capital of the world. In this latter point the colonies also were of special assistance, as along

with Roman manners and customs they introduced a certain degree of civilization into the countries, such as Britain, the provinces on the Danube and the Rhine, or in Syria, in all of which there were military stations. And since the Romans, as we have said, sought their culture amongst the Greeks, many philosophers, rhetoricians, teachers, and physicians came to Italy to spread the Greek language, philosophy, and morals, and, unfortunately, often Greek vices also. On the other hand the ambitious youths and men from Rome often journeyed into the land of the Hellenes, especially to Athens, Corinth, and Rhodes, in order to obtain a higher education.

In short, One empire, with One influential imperial city, made itself felt everywhere. That which obtained a firm footing in Rome could easily find access to every part of the world. Can we wonder that Peter and Paul both made Rome the goal of their endeavours, and that it was from Rome that Christianity was most extensively propagated? We have seen how the Roman rule and the Greek language and culture united at this time the most famous nations of ancient history. What was narrow, peculiar, and provincial began to recede, and a grand universalism was more and more developed in its place. National consciousness grew into world-consciousness. Must we not see in all this how the way was prepared for the universal religion, and how the world was made ready for the work of Christianity?



## II.

## RELIGIOUS LIFE IN THE HEATHEN WORLD.

NOT only did the circumstances we have described prepare the way for Christianity, but the inner life of the peoples in the empire showed that in religion and morals a change for the better must soon take place.

Let us look first at the state of religion.

Heathendom was not without religion, and St. Paul was right when upon the Areopagus at Athens (Acts xvii. 22) he declared that the Greeks, and in the widest sense the heathen, were "*too god-fearing*." In all antiquity, and especially at the time of Jesus, we find a great plenitude of gods and goddesses, numberless temples, manifold religious services and sacred performances. In town and country, in field and forest, sanctuaries were to be found; if not always temples, at least sacred trees, stones, and places. The whole life of the people was permeated with religion, and men were ready to perform acts of worship daily and hourly. Before every important action of the State the gods were consulted; every significant period of life was solemnized with religious rites, and a suitable tribute was paid to the god who was concerned; every household festival was marked by idolatrous worship; every rank in society had its own divinities, and they were to be found in all sorts of buildings; even brothels, cook-shops, and prisons, as Tertullian once said, had their deities.

But however manifold the religious life of the ancient world may be, and however numerous the different kinds of gods that we meet with, we may classify them into those of the Orient, of Greece, and of Rome.

One of the most marked characteristics of the people of the east, and that which distinguished them from those of the west, was a strong attachment to what was old and traditional, a love for the mysterious and for showy forms of worship. Viewed as a whole, their religion was a worship of Nature. Their deity was the hidden power of Nature itself as it is revealed now in creating, now in animating and sustaining, and again in destroying. Among the people of India the welfare of men was in a very special manner dependent upon atmospheric phenomena ; and accordingly we find that their deities were such as Indra, the god of the atmosphere, of the rain and the dew ; Vritra, the evil god, who opposes Indra, and restrains him from pouring out his blessings on the earth ; and Agni, the god of fire and source of creative heat. Formerly Brahma was regarded as the only and infinite creator of the world, by whom the powers of Nature, personified as deities, governed all things. The later Nature-worship recognized three principal divinities ; next to Brahma, the Soul of the world, the true invisible life of the creation, stood Vishnu, in whom were comprehended all the salutary phenomena and influences of Nature ; and Siva, as the eternal reproductive power of the world, generating new life out of destruction and ruin. Among the Medes and Persians religion and worship reflected the great contrasts of Nature, in Ormuzd, the god of light, and creator of all good, and Ahriman, the god of dark-

ness, and the source of all evil. The religious views of the Egyptians, without doubt, proceeded from simple worship of the sun and the Nile, and were by degrees spiritualized. With the Babylonians and Assyrians Baal was the active and Mylitta the passive power of Nature, the former being the creative and the latter the prolific principle. On the coast of Phenicia also, Nature was deified. Baal and Aschera, or Astarte, were the Nature-god in a general sense. This deity, as Baal, is the procreative and, as Aschera, is the fruit-bearing or productive power ; both being sometimes represented as united in one hermaphrodite divinity.<sup>23</sup> The religious festivals of the Phenicians were closely connected with the changes in the life of Nature. Indeed, the heathen gods themselves sometimes take their character of gentleness and gladness, or of gloom and terror, from the seasons. We need only refer to Moloch, the personification of the glowing, killing heat of summer, who was worshipped with the agonizing cries of children offered as burnt sacrifices ; or to the worship in honour of Mylitta, in which women of loose character, enticed to lewdness, and virgins sacrificed their chastity to the goddess.

Thus we find that the religion of the east everywhere was mere naturalism. But it was destined to become lifeless and powerless. The eternal sameness of the course of Nature gave rise to no new thought in the minds of the people. And therefore this species of religion furnished no further impulse to their sons than it had done to their grandfathers, and men came to regard it with indifference. They made use of it, and it was dependent upon them, not they upon it. The priests

themselves were not able to stop the decay, and instead of living reverence, worship became for the masses an obtuse superstition, and for thinking people, a subject of ridicule and scorn. Thus in the Orient faith sank lower and lower, and the eastern peoples were especially weary of their deities when Alexander conquered them, and under his dominion Greek forms of worship were established.

In contrast with the east, the Greeks in their deities idealized Nature and man. Their divinities are the moral powers of Nature and national life, to which fancy gave noble personified forms. If they lacked the rigour of oriental worship, they were free also from the terror and impurity of it. Some presentiment of the moral order of the world had dawned upon them. The Hellene recognized not only that there are ruling powers in Nature on which he was dependent, but also that the moral relations of men are governed by eternal laws, against which no one can sin with impunity. To the orientals, Baal was only the life-giving and scorching sun, but Zeus to the Greeks was the guardian of justice, the all-seeing eye, the retribution that was sure to come after wrong-doing; to the former Astarte was the sensual instinct of Nature, but Here to the latter was the protectress of domestic life and of marriage, a breach of which was certain to be avenged according to fixed order. Pallas Athene was the defender of pure reason, the victorious wisdom; and Apollo, the god of light, was the Divine Revealer of the Greek religion, who clears away obscurity, discovers guilt, and expiates it. So far all appears pure and charming; but yet mischievous frivolity was not far off. The

humanized gods had human faults and vices ; and Olympus itself was finally only a picture of natural existence, and the life of the Greek people.

If, however, the scope of religious ideas among the Greeks was richer and more moral than that of the Asiatics, it never had so much power over men's minds as the religions of the east. Long before the religion of Greece was carried into the east, Greek philosophers complained of the poets that they degraded the gods ; and the people complained of the philosophers, who sought by their teaching to create purer conceptions of the deity. New images and new stories of the gods were constantly produced, until the thoughtful mind soon came to regard the divinities as the imaginary creations of its own intuition. It is easy to understand that the natural consequence of such a state of things was the ruin of religious life in Greece, and at the time of Jesus that result was visible to all eyes.

In Italy religious life began to decline with the commencement of national decay, or, indeed, as soon as the highest point of political prosperity was reached. The old Latin gods were dry abstractions of civil and social order. Fides was the guardian of fidelity in public life ; Terminus, of the bounds and limits of land ; Juno, of the faithfulness of married couples ; Vesta, of the modesty and discipline of the home ; Æsculanus, of honesty in trade. There were, moreover, gods who in the opinion of the Romans taught children to cry, watched over them in the cradle, accustomed them to food and drink, and imparted the gifts of speech and singing. In the same way every situation and condition in the life of the indi-

vidual, the family, or the people, was ruled by its own guardian deity, whose favour it was necessary to supplicate. Hence it was that the strictness of religious worship was written in the public and private life of the ancient Romans; hence, too, the observance of every particular event and its interpretation by augurs, diviners, and pontiffs.

But it was the State and civil life for whose inner laws the Romans gradually came to feel the greatest reverence. Their gods were the powers upon which the welfare of the State was dependent. Jupiter Capitolinus assumed the form of the peculiar and principal deity of the Romans, and in reality was a representation of the State. Mars, the god of war, and Victoria, the goddess of victory, were the august powers to whom the Romans prayed willingly and assiduously. As long, therefore, as the sentiments which the gods represented were strong in the people, the divinities were sincerely revered, and this religiousness kept the life of the people healthy and strong. But when the State began to degenerate, faith also declined. As, in a practical point of view, the national religion of the Romans consisted in the creation of a world-wide empire, its decay, when that end was accomplished, was a natural consequence. And whereas beforetime the State was represented by Jupiter, the emperors now fulfilled that function, and assumed a position at the head of all the host of deities. The official worship of Imperialism became the State religion. Thus the ancient heathenism culminated in the deification of man. It is well known that at the obsequies of Augustus an eagle flew aloft from the funeral pile, and a Senator



testified upon oath that he had seen the emperor ascend to heaven. Divine honours were adjudged to this deified emperor, and festivals, temples, and a special college of priests established for the worship of him. And this took place continuously with every deceased emperor, so that Vespasian upon his dying bed could jest : " I shall soon become a god,"<sup>24</sup> although, as a matter of fact, he had forbidden that divine honours should be paid to himself. Caligula, however, did not wait for his own death, but caused the heads to be struck off from the statues of the pre-eminent deities, and replaced them with images of his own head, in order that he might be worshipped instead of the gods. Nero and Domitian bore themselves in a similar fashion, and the latter distinguished himself in his edicts as " Lord and God." In such a state of things how could the religion of the forefathers keep its ground, or continue to exercise influence over the hearts of men ? Was not religion and religious life bound to sink to a low ebb ?

It is just at the time when Jesus came that we recognize by many signs the breakdown of the Roman religion. Men were discontented with their own deities, and sought after new ones. This is partly the explanation of that toleration which it was a principle of Roman statesmanship to exercise towards all forms of worship in use among subject peoples, without concerning itself about doctrines and opinions in the matter of religion. Thus the Athenians maintained their worship of Athene till the year 146 A.D., and the Jews were unmolested in the service of Jehovah till 63. Such tolerance only found a limit when the doctrines of religion interfered with political life, and

especially when the character of the native religion provoked hostility against Rome. It was, doubtless, political wisdom to spare whatever was regarded as sacred among the peoples, and to leave them in the enjoyment of habits and customs which did not hinder them from rendering obedience and tribute to Rome ; but when we see how anxious the Romans were also to obtain the favour of foreign deities, we cannot help regarding their toleration as a sign of their waning faith in their own gods, and their expectation of finding better ones in those of other nations.

But the old principle was maintained still that in Rome itself no other than the gods of the country were to be revered, and that only in times of great distress, and by the solemn resolution of the State, should foreign deities be adopted in the Imperial City, and thereby naturalized among the gods of Rome. This was the theory ; but the actual state of things was different, owing to the fact that the former strict isolation of nations was broken up, intercourse between them was quickened, and thus the migration of particular forms of worship from their natural home into other lands was greatly assisted. And it is easy to understand that Italy, and especially Rome, was just the place where there would be the largest influx of all sorts and conditions of idolatry. Even the images of the foreign gods were allowed to be set up in Rome with tacit acquiescence. Temples were erected, and religious services of the most heterogeneous description were held. Neither the complaints of scrupulous Romans, nor measures taken by individual emperors were able to accomplish much against this. And thus



Greek temples were to be seen in the midst of Rome ; the Phrygian priests of Cybele and the Egyptian priests of Isis met together there ; and many a Roman worshipped the Jewish Jehovah, or addicted himself to the forms and ceremonies which eastern soothsayers, magicians, and astrologers brought with them from distant regions. The Persian worship of Mithra, and even fetichism, found its adherents among the people. Nero himself, when Astarte no longer satisfied him, revered only an amulet. The greater the distance from which any forms or ceremonies were brought, especially if they came from the far east, the greater the number of adherents they found among the crowd. Two things are clear : first, that the foreign idolatries which were national in their character and yet were separated from the nations to which they belonged, were sure to become enervated by degrees and lose their true significance ; faith in the gods began to fail ; the whole existence of religion was shaken. Second, that it could not be otherwise than that the religious chaos which as a fact had taken the place of the national religion should more and more undermine and destroy the native beliefs of the Romans. But heathenism, and especially Roman heathenism, had by no means run its course yet. Idols and their worshippers were numerous enough ; the temples stood yet in all their splendour ; the festivals and sacrifices were solemnized with great pomp ; and at the time of Caligula's accession to power, one hundred thousand animals are said to have been slaughtered within the space of three months as sacrificial victims. That heathenism would endure for some time yet seemed probable on account of its close connection with the State,

the continued existence of domestic religious customs, and the stable forms of idolatrous worship which were rigorously maintained in particular districts.

If, however, there was still much external religious life, the deep inward faith was wanting, and among the higher classes a scepticism which was especially favoured by Greek enlightenment showed itself everywhere. A Cato and a Cæsar acknowledged it openly ; Lucretius, with fiery zeal, denounced all belief as a gigantic hobgoblin, and the gods as the abortions of fear ; and Pliny lays it down as a certain result of science that there are no deities, and that Nature alone is to be recognized as God. Others endeavoured in vain to sustain the ancient faith ; such as a Dionysius, for example, who in his Roman history expresses his admiration of Romulus for his loyalty to the gods, and his care to retain their favour ; or a Plutarch, whose works show him to have been a man of genuine heathen faith and piety.

Most of the educated people struck out for themselves a middle course, and while not openly rejecting the common belief, for the sake of its conservative elements, reserved for themselves a more enlightened opinion. And thus two kinds of religion were distinguished : the esoteric religion of the cultivated, and the exoteric religion of the multitude. Varro, indeed, separates from the religion of the people the mythical conception for the poets, and the physical for the philosophers.

It may be thought that the work of the philosophers, who were professed truth-seekers, must have been helpful to religion ; but they were just the men whose influence in the circles of the most attentive and thoughtful was

potent in the general breakdown of heathen religion. They enlightened men's minds, and destroyed the old faith, but had nothing new to offer in its place, nothing which was beyond doubt and would stand the test and satisfy the heart. At the best they could only advance a little beyond others in the matter. The multifariousness of their systems led to confusion, and by their whole nature and character they were incapable of restoring the political, religious, and moral life of the nation.

Among the three philosophical systems which were the most widely spread, the *Scepticism* of Pyrrho's epoch was at first a 'suspense of judgment,' but by degrees advanced to the mere balancing of 'probabilities,' and then to universal doubt of the reality of knowledge. The Sceptic Lucian says roundly that everything is uncertain, even the existence of the gods. In his "*Jupiter Tragædus*" he utters, among other things, the ironical syllogism:—"If there are altars, there must also be gods; now there are altars, and consequently there must be gods." *Epicureanism* set aside all objective knowledge, and if it did not absolutely deny the existence of the gods, it would not allow that they troubled themselves about the affairs of the world. It was for the most part indifferent to religion, and looked upon pleasure and enjoyment as the highest good. *Stoicism*, the third of the three systems, found the chief good in virtue: its adherents might be called mediatorial theologians, since they sought to unite faith and philosophy. They assumed a superior deity, a pantheistic god, who is the All of things; but under him they accepted many minor deities who coincided with the gods of the popular religion. Thus the Stoics united the esoteric and

exoteric conceptions of religion, and stand before us as undoubtedly the noblest of all the heathen sects, as men who had some presentiment of Christianity, and who were not far from the kingdom of God. Nevertheless it is certain that even they could not save the ancient faith of heathenism.

The distinguishing mark of that time was the gradual dying out of the native religions of the different countries. In the circles of the educated, faith in the gods of the old religion had almost vanished. The mass of the people still adhered externally, and from inherited habits, to their divinities, but they had no firm trust in them, and preferred to hold by the most visible of them—the *divus Cæsar Augustus*. Complete atheism and nihilism were only of rare occurrence, but a certain pantheistic monotheism, which arose out of the dissolution of polytheism, was held by many. The various deities were, so to speak, blended into one Nature-god, and Nature was God ! Was there not, however, in this monotheism some dim apprehension of the one true and only God ?

But it was nothing more than a presage ; and, besides, heathenism was full of errors, delusions, and defects. It had no future life ; for it the highest goal that could be reached lay in this world. The ancients lived and thought only for this earth, for their own enjoyment, for the glory of the world and of human life, for art and the State. They struggled for happiness, but could not discover the way that led to it. The gods were not able to afford them any guidance, nor to lead them to the highest objects ; and in the customary worship many could no longer find any satisfaction and comfort.

Very characteristic in relation to this are the prayers to the gods that we meet with. People prayed for wealth, for the comforts and enjoyments of life, and for the prosperity of their undertakings. They never seem to have thought of asking for moral good from the divinity. "Jupiter give me life and riches," said Horace,<sup>25</sup> "the firm and tranquil mind I will procure for myself." Seneca<sup>26</sup> teaches that man must make his own happiness, and that it is disgraceful to become troublesome to the gods with prayers relating thereto. Maximus of Tyre devotes a treatise to proving that it is better not to pray at all. And thus it happened that when neither prayers nor vows accomplished anything, the anger of the people against the gods manifested itself in reviling and outraging their images.

Even as little as the gods which the people made for themselves, were the philosophers able to show the way of salvation. Neither Epicurus with his—"Enjoy thyself!" nor the Sceptics with their—"Give up all thought of acquiring certain knowledge!" nor the famous Stoics themselves with their—"Abstain and endure; be sufficient for thyself!" could, as we have seen, teach men the secret of holiness and happiness. The whole school of Zeno and his followers were ignorant of that. Their doctrine was not without internal contradictions: it could not comfort men in their sorrows; they did not feel themselves morally strengthened by their self-pleasing pride of virtue, which would be indebted to itself alone for all things, which laid claim to equality with the gods, and made pretensions to their calmness and security, yet remained only human, frail, and faulty. Sooner even

than might have been expected, this most important of the heathen schools of philosophy became extinct.

Even the State, as such, could not afford any help. As long as the great consideration was the upbuilding and enlargement of the edifice of Imperialism, it had animated the minds of its citizens with a love of manliness (*virtus*) which showed itself practically in courage, and the ability and honour of a citizen; but with the failing life of the State all moral support failed also, and the old and venerable *virtus* perished.

When, with all their endeavours and seeking and hoping, men could not reach the longed-for goal, they came at last to the conclusion of heathen wisdom: "*Patet exitus!*"—"There is a way of escape open—Death!" Pliny held the best of man's abilities to be that he can put an end to his own life. Petronius, the man of pleasure, in the midst of a carousal in Nero's time, quietly opened a vein, entertained himself and his friends with frivolous things, and had profligate poetry recited before him; when something came that was especially jovial, he had the artery bound up again, in order that he might enjoy all, even to the last moment. And Seneca<sup>27</sup> uttered the following words:—"Seest thou that steep precipice? From thence is the way to freedom. Seest thou that sea, the river, the well? There in its depths is freedom! Seest thou yon low withered tree? There hangs freedom. Hast thou not a neck, a throat, a heart? There is deliverance from bondage!" With that "*patet exitus*," however, man only declared himself bereft of all resources; for however much he may think that self-murder is a virtue, a victory



of the great '*I*,' it is much rather its utter discomfiture.

But besides such voices of despair many a sorrowful cry was heard, like that of the Apostle: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Romans vii. 24). "I am tossed," said Seneca,<sup>28</sup> "upon a sea of pure infirmity." "The human mind is by nature perverse and strives after what is forbidden and perilous." "We must say of ourselves that we are evil, have been evil, and—unhappily, I must add—shall be also in the future." A knowledge of the weaknesses of human nature, of the natural sinfulness of men, and of the vanity of the world increased; insight into the inability of humanity to deliver itself became more definite, the longing after a God exalted above all that is earthly and worldly ever more conscious, the desire of salvation ever more living. "Nobody," said Seneca,<sup>29</sup> "can deliver himself; some one must stretch out a hand to him to lift him up." More and more also men began to turn their thoughts to a future life. Some denied that there was any; others were filled with dubious thoughts about it. But one thing is certain, people were asking: "Is there a future, an immortal life? And how can one attain to it?" It is a question which has led many a believer to the Christian faith. People looked with expectancy towards the east, from whence it was thought that the Deliverer would come. Suetonius<sup>30</sup> and Tacitus<sup>31</sup> relate that the opinion was general, that the east would become powerful, and that Judea would obtain the rule over the world. And Virgil<sup>32</sup> sings of the son of Asinius Pollio, who would bring again the Golden Age, the Child who should descend from heaven

and bring peace on earth (comp. Isaiah ix. 6, 7). Such presageful anticipations of heathen poets were fulfilled, but in a higher sense than they ever dreamed of. Jesus Christ gave the right answer to the insoluble questions of heathendom. Looking at the tottering and falling fabric of heathen faith, who can mistake the higher hand which was pointing to the Saviour and the new age of faith?

---

### III.

#### THE STATE OF MORALS AMONG THE GENTILES.

WITH the downfall of the ancestral religion, the good old discipline and morality perished also. It is true that at the same time we find moralizing literature enough, such as Seneca's discourses on virtue, and the writings of Horace, Juvenal, and Tacitus. It was also the fashion to receive philosophers into the house, not merely as teachers, but as educators, and to obtain from them counsel and advice as respects character and conduct. But only too often the corrupt life was the direct contradiction of the moralizing teachings. Seneca, for example, the preacher of abstemiousness, was at the same time a covetous man and a spendthrift; the preacher of morals was an adulterer; the enthusiast for kindness and goodwill to men had a share in the cruelties of Nero, and took the part of one of his pupils who was a matricide. And so it was almost always. Ever more general, ever more despairing, became the lamentations over the breaches of



honourable living, and the growing corruption of morals. And thus Juvenal could write<sup>33</sup> :—

“A ninth age of the world is ours, in wickedness greater  
Than that of iron ; and Nature herself for its badness  
No name hath as yet found out, and no base metal engendered.”  
And Horace says of his time<sup>34</sup> :—

“ Our fathers, worse in their day than our grandsires,  
Begot us a still more degenerate race ;  
And soon will a worse brood than we are succeed us.”

Indeed, Seneca does not exaggerate when he says<sup>35</sup> :

“All is full of misdoing and vice ; more sin is committed than can be made amends for by punishment. The delight in wickedness becomes greater day by day, and the fear of it less. Vice no longer conceals itself, but appears unabashed before all eyes. Innocence is not merely rare, but almost non-existent.” And in Livy<sup>36</sup> we read : “Through virtue Rome became great, and now we can endure neither our vices nor their antidote.” The moral corruption began in the imperial palace ; the higher classes imitated the doings of the emperors and their retinue, and the crowd followed after. Thus the decay of morals became universal.

Above all it was to be seen in the domestic life of the period. In Greece the strict morality of family life had long been lost. In Rome it was preserved for a longer time ; but since she had become great and rich, since she had absorbed Greek frivolity along with Greek culture, the old simple family-life had passed away, and with it uprightness of conduct, chastity, and discipline. People paid more attention to outward show, to the splendour of the toilette, to amusement and enjoyment, than to propriety in the family, faithfulness in wedlock, the

education of children, and virtue among servants. The house was amply stored with various sorts of soaps, paints, and cosmetics ; manifold shapes of false hair, imported from Germany or the east, disfigured the head ; and the greatest possible splendour of numerous garments adorned with gold, pearls, and precious stones, was exhibited in the families of the richer sort. The women hastened daily to the exhibitions in the theatre and the circus, or to banquets and revels ; and if the poorer class of them had not means enough to make a show with their own possessions, they hired waiting-women by the day, who attended upon them, and sedan chairs in which they were carried to feasts and places of amusement and even clothes to conceal their real poverty.

What has been said will have indicated that many women paid but little attention to the duties of married life ; they were too much occupied with other things. But other circumstances also point to the conclusion that at the time of Jesus true happiness was very seldom to be found in Roman wedlock. The corruption of married and family life had indeed reached a fearful pass. Even great names, such as Pompey, Cæsar, Augustus, are identified with shameful stories of adultery. Augustus, for example, not only seduced the wives of others—out of policy, as his friends said, in order to spy upon their husbands—but sent covered litters direct to the houses of the most distinguished Romans, to bring their wives into his palace. Divorces and violations of marriage vows were familiar daily events. Laws were passed against celibacy and fornication, by which it was thought to put a stop to these evils, to render divorces more difficult, and to lessen

their number, but unfortunately they were ineffectual. Marriages were contracted as wantonly and carelessly as they were afterwards dissolved. There were, as was said—surely with some exaggeration—women who counted their years not by the consulates, but by the number of husbands they had had. And Juvenal<sup>37</sup> relates that many wives were divorced again before the green branches had withered, which decked the door of the house for their entrance when newly married. Marriage was for the man often only a matter of business and finance, and for the woman a means of escape from the restraints of the nursery. As soon as a girl had passed her twelfth year she was considered marriageable, and as a rule was married between her thirteenth and sixteenth years. Daughters took formal leave of their childhood when they deposited their dolls and other toys in the temple of Venus. Entrance upon married life was for the girl, because of her extreme youth, generally a hasty passage from absolute dependence to unlimited freedom. Even while yet a child the youthful wife found herself suddenly transported into a large and glittering world, surrounded with all sorts of temptations and perils, and was seldom capable of using the unlimited freedom for her own happiness and welfare, and that of the family. Very unfavourable judgments upon women are therefore to be found in the pages of heathen writers. Pliny<sup>38</sup> affirms that since the censorship of Mesalla and Cassius, modesty had ceased to exist in Rome; and Horace<sup>39</sup> tells us that womanly virtue was no longer to be found. Tacitus<sup>40</sup> praises Germany in contrast with Rome, because there nobody laughed at vice, and seduction was not the fashion

of the time. Fidelity in wedlock was scoffed at; and Seneca<sup>41</sup> relates that intrigues and seductions were prevalent customs. He who had not distinguished himself by a love-affair, and stood in no dishonourable relation with another man's wife, was treated with contempt by women, and regarded as an effeminate person. Indeed things became so bad, that married ladies of high rank had their names inserted in the police register as women of a certain character, in order that they might give themselves up to unbridled debauchery.<sup>42</sup>

The so-called polite literature of the time, which often could hardly have been outdone in immorality, had a very injurious effect on the female sex. To this was added the evil influence of pictorial art. The most infamous pictures were painted on walls and ceilings, which the innocent eyes of women and girls could not avoid seeing. The revels at banquets and the vicious enticements of plays and spectacles were of the worst description. The passion for the latter arose out of curiosity and the desire of being seen; and too often impure love-affairs and intrigues took place in the theatre. Comedy and farce, full of coarse unequivocal lewdness, and lascivious pantomimic dances incited to sensuality. The scenes of public torture in the arena brutalized men's minds, and destroyed all tender sensibilities; and the banquets with their debaucheries, their obscene theatrical representations, their immodest songs, and their infamous dances—in which the closest approximation of the sexes was for the most part the object aimed at—continually resulted in amours, seductions, and matrimonial infidelity.

If children were born of a marriage, the parents did

not recognize it as a duty and a joy to train them up and form them for virtue, but, to their own and the children's injury, left them to the training and management of slaves. To be blessed with children was no pleasure, but a burden ; and hence people did not shrink from infanticide, or at least from the exposure and abandonment of their offspring. Even Augustus commanded that the child which his grand-daughter Julia bore after her banishment should be taken from her and exposed. This was often done, in the hope that passers-by would save the child and bring it up. But if so, what was its lot? The boy was commonly trained as a gladiator, the girl brought up to be a prostitute. Among the higher orders worse things than the exposure of children were done. Forcible means were employed to procure miscarriage, either from dread of the pains of parturition, or that the figure of the woman might not be injured. Things must have come to a terrible pass, when Seneca boasts of it as an especial excellence in his mother that she had not destroyed the hope of motherhood in her womb. While in Christian households there is an average of five or six children to a family, in the Roman empire three living children were considered the mark of fertility, in consideration of which the father was granted freedom from all personal public burdens. And thus marriage sank ever deeper into ruin, and many men preferred the freedom of unmarried life, and surrendered themselves rather to all sorts of lascivious sins, and to acts which cannot be named in particular. Opportunities for indulgence in sinful pleasures were found everywhere, even in the midst of the temple, where often the priestesses were gay women ; so that Tertullian<sup>43</sup>

brands temples, groves, and other sacred places as nests of adultery, lewdness, and other abominable crimes. What is said in Romans i. 24 had at that time its full justification.

Of course there were noble exceptions ; many a good wife was the "light of the house ;" many a marriage was contracted and maintained in fidelity ; and also earnest preachers of repentance were not wanting, who exhorted to honourable life, such as Tacitus, who in his "Germania," held up the modesty and morality of German women as a mirror for his contemporaries. But on the whole the state of things was very bad indeed ; and the continuous decay of all good domestic morals and propriety of conduct is certain. Nothing short of the Christian religion was able to restore family life ; just as it alone could bring to an age boasting of its 'humanities' the true humanity, that is, the equal estimation of the various classes of men as men. The Romans thought themselves exalted far above slaves and freedmen. In their eyes the slave was at best only partially a man, and they denied to him all free will and all capacity for virtue. Varro, for example, cited once three kinds of chattels as needful for agriculture : the dumb, such as waggons and implements ; those with inarticulate language, such as oxen ; and those that speak, that is the slaves. Others went beyond even this conception, and the word used by Horace, Cicero, and others, to denote a slave, that is "*mancipium*," or a possession, speaks for itself. The slaves were to them not persons but things, since they did not possess anything, but were themselves possessions. The treatment that slaves received corresponded to this. They were bought



and sold, pledged or exchanged, given away or inherited—were according to necessity or convenience destined for handicrafts and trades ; for gladiatorial combats or for the brothel ; or indeed even to be door-keepers, chained like watch-dogs. People punished them at their own pleasure, and often murdered them upon the smallest pretext. The aged were exposed or driven away with entire unconcern about what became of them ; or slain as if they were cattle. Nobody could interfere with the master in doing this, and nobody called him to account for it. “Against slaves all is lawful,” was a principle of Roman law. The condition of field-slaves was miserable in the extreme ; they were often shut up by thousands in the slave-pens ; and, at night especially, were chained by the feet. But the domestic slaves also suffered terribly ; they were obliged to be always at hand ready for any service, and woe to them if they committed a fault. The female slaves were frequently compelled to perform their duties with bare shoulders and breasts, in order that they might feel the more sharply the thrusts and blows of their mistresses upon their naked flesh. A slave was often as a punishment fettered to a block, upon which he sat, or which he had to drag about with him by day and night. Treated according to caprice, and held in subjection by fear alone, the natural result was that the slaves themselves became base in disposition, lazy in work, lying and deceitful in their conversation, bitterly hostile against their masters, and ready for mutiny and vengeance. And yet they knew well that if a conspiracy was discovered among the slaves of any master, all would have to atone for it, whether innocent or guilty ; and that if the lord of the house met

with his death through any slave, all his fellow slaves under the same roof must die for it.

The number of slaves who were employed in the service of the same family appears to us extraordinarily great. There were "*atrienses*" for the *atrium*, the principal room of the house ; "*cubicularii*" for service in the sleeping chambers ; "*secretarii*" for the composition of letters ; "*lectores*" or readers ; "*introductores*" to usher in visitors, and "*nomenclatores*" to tell the master the names of his clients and persons whose votes he wished to solicit. There were also stewards, bath-attendants, cooks, letter-carriers, sedan-chair bearers, grooms, and others. For the slaves owned by the municipality as many as one hundred and twenty offices and occupations are enumerated. Horace held that for the service of people in easy circumstances ten slaves were the smallest number ; but many had more than a thousand. Scaurus, for example, had four thousand ; and Crassus so many that his gang of builders and carpenters alone was over five hundred strong.

Next in rank to the slaves stood the freedmen, from whom the lower class of officials, overseers, bailiffs, &c., were recruited ; or by whom the smaller retail trades and crafts were carried on. But none of them really possessed the dignity of a freeman ; they remained slavish in spirit, and often became the pliant instruments of the crimes and vices of their lords.

The work of the slaves and the so-called freedmen was to labour and provide for the free Romans. To the latter labour was a disgrace, so that even Cicero despised every occupation by which money was earned as degrading slavery. And as a matter of fact the Roman people of



that time spent their lives without earnest work of any kind. Two classes of the population must be distinguished : the rich and the poor. A middle class, such as we see to-day, scarcely existed. Thus the intermediate orders, such as small tradesmen, mechanics, and other industrial people were very sparingly represented, because slave-labour was cheaper and more sought after ; and because the distribution of corn by the State enabled the poorest to live entirely or almost without labour. Instead of honest labour to obtain support, those who had no other means of living sought their bread as ‘clients,’ or dependents on the houses of the great people who were their ‘patrons.’ They made their visits early in the morning, and often accompanied their lords on their way to the senate, to the baths, or to amusements. They accepted as part of the order of things the greatest insults which they had to bear, not only from the ‘patrons’ themselves, but frequently from their slaves also.

Of a free peasantry likewise there is not much to be said ; the civil wars had almost made an end of them. The discharged legions of the victor were commonly provided for by landed property in Italy, as was done by Sulla and Octavius. But as old soldiers seldom make good farmers they commonly preferred to sell their possessions to the large land-owners. From this cause enormous territories were acquired by a few individuals. Cicero complains of this evil in his oration against Verres : “We have suffered for many years, because the money of all the people has passed into the hands of some few men ; you see all landed property distributed in some few large estates.” And Seneca<sup>44</sup> says : “Large tracts of land

are cultivated by chained gangs of slaves ; an immense stock of cattle needs provinces and kingdoms for grazing grounds, hordes of servants larger than warlike races, and buildings the circuit of which is greater than that of some large cities." The sensible farmer directs his attention to profitable cultivable fields ; but at that time people were not in a position to put their land to the best use, because of its vast extent and the scarcity of labour. So, as bad farming did not pay then any more than now, they fell back on cattle-breeding and grazing ; and thus instead of waving fields of corn one saw only vast tracts grazed by cattle, and in parts bare and desolate. The Romans, especially those with no means, preferred to dwell in the city rather than in the country. Excessive numbers migrated from the rural districts into Rome, and thus the population of the imperial city was estimated at nearly two millions. But of these only about ten thousand belonged to the higher orders ; the bulk was composed partly of the foreigners, and to a far larger extent of the slaves and the poor. For the most part the latter lived in a state of extreme poverty, and got their bread from other people's hands. If moreover the slaves were supported by their masters, and the 'clients,' or dependents generally, by their 'patrons,' there were still about two hundred thousand poor citizens who with their wives, sisters, and children had to be supported by the State ; and beyond these again there were still thousands of poor wretches who were shut out from State aid, and whose only places of shelter were the porticoes and vestibules of the temples. In other cities than Rome, where the regular distribution of money and corn did not take

place, the number of miserable poor was relatively not less great. The Romans did not give willingly and generously, but almost always because they were compelled to do so. "Why give anything to a beggar?" said Plautus,<sup>45</sup> "one only loses what is given and prolongs the miserable life of the poor." Nobody thought then of founding almshouses for the poor or a hospital for the sick. Julian was the first to conceive such an idea, and he was inspired by the example of the Christians.

In contrast with the misery of the poor, the few who were very rich revelled in unheard of excess and luxury. Cicero, with his fortune of about one hundred and fifty thousand pounds, did not belong to the richest class of senators. It is computed that from one to one and a half millions were often accumulated in the hands of one man. Aspicus killed himself because he could not live as he thought on about twenty-five thousand pounds, the residue of a fortune of seven hundred thousand pounds. The public and private buildings exhibited great splendour and prodigal expenditure. The magnificent house of Cicero was valued at thirty-six thousand pounds; that of Clodius at one hundred and twenty thousand pounds; that of Mæcenæ equally high. But the "golden house" of Nero was the great wonder of the time. It enclosed fields, gardens, meadows, woods, and even a lake. The entrance to this edifice could admit a large 'colossus' one hundred and twenty feet high, and the galleries were each a mile long. The water of the sea was brought in to supply the baths, and sulphur-water from the hot springs of Tiber. The wealthy Roman was not content with his splendid city residence, but in addition built villas in the mountains

or by the sea. People were always ready to build and construct, and no age has been so filled with a passion for architecture as that of which we speak. Palaces and temples, theatres and baths, triumphal arches and statues, bridges and roads, aqueducts and conduits, were built everywhere. This was the case not in Rome only, but also in other cities and smaller towns. Pompeii, which a great fatality has preserved for us in its originality, is a sufficient proof of this.

The interiors of dwellings did not present the comforts, conveniences, and agreeable features of those of to-day, notwithstanding their greater splendour and sumptuousness. But, according to the descriptions of contemporary writers, imagination can hardly conceive the noble arrangement of the houses, the elegance of the furniture and utensils, the fineness and costliness of draperies, and the general luxuriousness.

Within these magnificent homes greed of enjoyment, effeminacy, and voluptuousness held full sway. Numerous slaves were at hand, ready to come or go at any moment, banquets and other festivals followed close upon one another ; so that the use of emetics was resorted to, to rid the stomach of the undigested food, and prepare for new repasts. An enormous and unnecessary expenditure for viands from the most distant countries, for the rarest flowers in the midst of winter, for costly unguents and perfumed waters, was always exhibited on such occasions. Large ships and caravans were constantly employed bringing delicacies and jewels from the farthest provinces to the houses of the rich Romans. What mattered the price ? The dearer the better ! For some foreign birds,

which were considered great luxuries for the table, more than one hundred pounds each was sometimes paid ; and some kinds of salt-water fish cost about forty pounds each. Hirtius, for the maintenance of his stock of sea fish in canals and ponds, required a yearly expenditure of sixty thousand pounds. The simple supper that Lucullus had prepared in haste for Cæsar and Pompey cost fifteen hundred pounds.

But what was the result of such luxury and voluptuousness ? The life of enjoyment was mentally, morally, and physically enervating and ruinous. It produced, as is affirmed by contemporaries, a race of men with pallid faces, flabby cheeks, swollen eyes, trembling hands, and large stomachs—a race weak in intellect, without recollection and moral power. Life was passed away by the larger number in pleasure and sensual gratification. For very many there was no higher or ideal good. The passion for spectacles and plays is an evidence of that. In the theatre it was no more the grave tragedy which held men's attention, but plays representing adulteries and love intrigues, in the dialogue of which virtue and the gods were openly scoffed at. The chief object sought was the gratification of sensual passion by obscenity and especially by the dancing of half or quite nude female performers. The circus and the amphitheatre were thronged with the people. "Bread and play" was the motto of that time. Thus abundant supplies of corn were imported for food, and numerous plays and spectacles provided for amusement. Not infrequently the hungry people had to be fed immediately after the public festivities. Under Augustus there were

sixty days in succession celebrated by games and plays ; under Marcus Aurelius, a hundred and thirty-five. It was the same in the provinces ; theatres were erected wherever it was practicable, and it is well known that Agrippa, to the horror of the Jews, had a circus built in Jerusalem. At the chariot races in Cæsar's time, in the circus at Rome, there were often one hundred and fifty thousand spectators present ; in the days of Titus two hundred and fifty thousand ; at a later period three hundred and twenty-five thousand. In the ampitheatre the famous combats of the gladiators took place, also animal-baitings, and representations of battles on sea and land. And at the present day we may read upon the walls, which eighteen hundred years ago were buried by the ashes of Vesuvius, the invitations to such mournful exhibitions. The worst of all was that the scenes were enacted not in mere show but in terrible earnest. In these games hundreds often met with their death in one day, and many a poor Christian of the earliest times, and many a grey-headed bishop was sacrificed to the greed of the people for sight-seeing.

In the provinces the state of things was not so bad as it was in Italy, especially in Rome ; but it was certainly not much better. Roman rule brought not only civilization but often immorality also to rude and uncultivated peoples. Many a seat of Roman government and authority became also a school of Roman vices. The procurators commonly led the way in evil living. They obtained much wealth by oppression and exaction, and collected all sorts of treasure ; this indeed was the principal object of their management. Crassus, for example, is said to have taken from the treasury of the temple in



Jerusalem ten thousand talents, equal to about two and a quarter millions sterling, of which immense treasure a large part was his own share. The procurator Felix hoped to obtain a bribe from a man so poor as Paul. The lower class of officials in the empire, of course, followed the example of their superiors ; the soldiers sought to do as well for themselves as the officers ; and the rest of the people, as they had opportunity and ability, did not lag behind in the general moral delinquency. Self-indulgence and sensual pleasure was the object and endeavour of all.

The moral emptiness and desolation of the ancient world is evident to all eyes. It had no moral and spiritual purpose by which to solve the problems that are vital to the very existence of the State. The upbuilding of political life with all its earnestness and struggle and endeavour was over. Many things sank into the mere shows and semblances of realities ; and, in truth, this was the case with the assemblies of the people, the Senate, and the high offices of religion and the State. Everything was sacrificed to appetite, enjoyment, and play. Because heathenism had no goal beyond the grave, it had no worthy purpose and aim on this side of it.

The picture which our survey has unfolded before the mind's eye is, for the most part, a melancholy one. Undoubtedly there were, notwithstanding what has been said, some healthy elements, and reputable homes, and brave true men in the Roman empire. We must remember, too, that what is known of the moral life of the period, has mostly come down to us from Rome itself ; and that in the imperial city, the centre of the world, the moral corruption was naturally greater than in the provinces,

where the good old traditions and habits must have maintained their ground for a much longer time. We must also admit that the night-side of life, the evil that is rampant at any period will from its own nature attract attention more than the good, which largely works in the stillness and out of sight. Nevertheless, the result of our brief survey of the state of the heathen world in the time of Christ can lead to no other conclusion than that it was, morally and religiously considered, fast hastening to ruin ; and that in heathenism itself, as we have shown in our last chapter, there was no force from which renewal of life and moral regeneration could proceed. The general impotence was felt ; the longing after a moral and religious ' new creation ' became ever more living and deep. But the power by which it was to be wrought could not come from within ; it had to come from above. It was only when the Christian religion appeared that a fountain was opened, from which streams of new life flowed through a world that was morally and religiously sick and dying, and by which the Old world was transformed into the New. The expectant gaze of the nations was directed towards the East ; and in the East lived the people of whom the Saviour was to be born—the Jewish people.



## PART SECOND.

*The Jewish World.*

## I.

## THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.

PALESTINE, the “promised land of the people of the old covenant,” is a small country, bounded on the north and to the north-east, by Phenice and Syria ; south and south-east, by Arabia ; and west, by the Mediterranean Sea. In its greatest extent it is only about one hundred and sixty miles long, and about seventy miles broad. Its entire area is about eleven thousand square miles. But this little country was the birth-place of the religion that was destined to conquer the world.

In its physical formation Palestine is a mountainous country. In the north rises Lebanon, from which two parallel chains of mountains extend into Galilee ; from thence an almost continuous range of moderately high hills stretches through Samaria and Judea to the southern border of the country. On their western sides they slope gradually down towards the Mediterranean ; but on the east, in the direction of the river Jordan, especially in the

region of the Dead Sea, the descent is much steeper. Beyond the Jordan a similar mountain range stretches in the same direction through the country from north to south. Intervening between the two ranges, and also between the western chain and the Mediterranean, are fertile plains. In a north-easterly direction from the range of hills called Mount Carmel, is another large stretch of level land termed the Plain of Jezreel. The Jordan is the only important river of the country ; it rises in the north, and after forming first the little lake Merom and, a few miles further down, the large lake of Gennesaret, sometimes called the Sea of Tiberias, it flows through the, for the most part, rich pastoral plain of the Jordan between the two above-mentioned mountain ranges, and finally loses itself in the Dead Sea. And thus Palestine with its succession of mountains, and plains, and hills, and valleys, is a land which presents every variety of landscape and configuration of soil—the most diversified and chequered scenery united within a small space. This variety in the physical formation of the country necessarily gave rise to various callings and occupations among its inhabitants. The narrow stretch of land along the coast of the Mediterranean, separated from the interior by the mountains, was favourable to maritime employments ; the valleys and plains were suitable for agriculture ; the slopes of the mountains also admitted of the cultivation of crops, but were especially favourable for the growth of vines and figs. The steppes, or stretches of uncultivated country, and the whole south of Judea, rendered possible the most extensive cattle and sheep farming ; and even the ridges of the mountains and their declivities afforded

rich pasture for smaller cattle and sheep. The land was a 'garden of God' and like a cornucopia of the most manifold productions (Deut. vii. 7-9). In several places in the Old Testament it is called a "good land," "flowing with milk and honey," and a "large fat land" (Exodus iii. 8, Nehemiah ix. 25-35, Exodus xiii. 5). It is also described by Josephus and others as having been very productive in the time of Jesus.<sup>46</sup> But its blessings were dependent upon attention, care, and true industry. The clayey or sandy-marly soil required thorough culture, and the insufficiency of natural springs of water had to be remedied by artificial irrigation, and by great care of the woods and forests. When, in later centuries, instead of the diligent cultivation of the soil, indolence and neglect prevailed, the ground lost its fertility, and in the place of the once blossoming and fruitful fields the eye sees to-day only bare and desolate wastes. The extraordinary productiveness of the country explains the fact that in former times it supported an immense population. It is considered that in David's time there may have been as many as between four and five millions living in this little country, and at the time of Jesus the population must have been nearly or quite as great.<sup>47</sup>

If we look now to its geographical situation, no country could have been more adapted than Palestine for the purpose which in the order of Divine Providence it was intended to fulfil, that is, the training and education of a people of God, and the sending forth of salvation from them to all the world. Separated by its natural formation from the neighbouring countries, it lay at the same time in the midst of the ancient civilization. In its retired

situation it was like a vineyard (Isaiah v.), fenced in and guarded by walls and hedges. The mountains of Lebanon, the Syrian and Arabian deserts, and Arabia Petræa with its rock-formations, were its natural barriers. The sea itself shut it off, because the strong currents running off the coast were a hindrance to navigation, and the harbours were held by foreigners. In addition to this there were no water-ways affording facilities for commerce between the interior and the outer world, since the Jordan was by its formation and position entirely unadapted for such a purpose. Even the neighbouring peoples, who were so hostile to the Jews in the earlier centuries of their history, were an enclosure round about them. But all the same the country was near the centre of the three divisions of the ancient civilized world. Four great trading thoroughfares passed near its borders : one in the north, extending from the Phenician sea-port towns of Tyre and Sidon to Damascus in Syria, and thence as far as the Euphrates ; a second in the east, leading from Damascus into Arabia ; a third in the west, from Egypt into Phenicia and Syria ; and another in the south, passing from Gaza into Egypt and thence to the Persian Gulf. Thus Palestine was surrounded by the most noted and advanced peoples of antiquity, Egyptians and Phenicians, Assyrians and Babylonians ; and it lay right in the path of their political and commercial intercourse. This is proved by the history of Egypt, Babylon, and Persia, as well as by the condition of the Jewish people in every epoch. The country was most fit to be the great scene of the history of redemption ; the people, although separated from other nations, could easily enter into com-

munication with them and propagate their faith among them ; and the messengers of the Gospel, as heralds of salvation, could make their way from Palestine into all nations and all parts of the world.

The primitive population of the country consisted of the families of the twelve sons of the patriarch Jacob, which had grown into strong tribes. But the course of time, and especially the great exile, had brought many changes and vicissitudes, and much intermixture of families and tribes, so that the people who boasted of their ancestry and descent were after all, in many respects, a different race from those of David's time. This was more particularly the case in Samaria.<sup>48</sup> But even the inhabitants of Judea and Galilee were not the descendants of the whole ten tribes, but only of Judah and Benjamin, who—with the exception of the Priests and Levites—were all that returned from captivity,<sup>49</sup> and of the remnant of the Jewish people who had remained in their own land, and at the restoration attached themselves to the returning exiles.<sup>50</sup> Moreover the language of the country was of a different character from what it once had been. The ancient Hebrew, after the captivity, gradually ceased to be the common speech of the people. It remained the language of the learned and of religion and worship, but had to be translated to be made intelligible to the laity. On the other hand the Aramaic, called in the Bible Syrian, had since the time of the Syrian empire been more and more naturalized in Palestine. Of the sacred books, parts of Ezra (from chapter iv. 8 to vi. 18, and vii. 12-26) and Daniel (chap. ii. 4 to vii. 28) were written in Aramaic. And the New Testament evidently shows that in the time

of Jesus this was the language of the people, for it is full of Aramaicisms, such as : *Golgotha* (Matthew xxvii. 33) ; *Abba* (Mark xiv. 26) ; *Messiah*, for *Meschiach* (John i. 41) Kephaz (John i. 42) ; and the deeply-affecting words of Jesus from the cross : "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?" (Matthew xxvii. 46).

At the same time the Greek language and even Greek customs were not unknown in the east as well as in the west of the country, In the population of the towns on the coast the Greek element preponderated ; and if the mass of the Jewish people had but a slight acquaintance with Greek it was certainly known to the higher class and the educated. The chief city of Samaria bore at the time of Jesus the Greek name of Sebaste. It had a Greek coinage and even Greek worship. At Tiberias in Galilee a large portion of the population was of Greek nationality. In Judea itself, and especially at Jerusalem, Greek was well known ; and Herod had many Hellenes at his court. Rome carried on its intercourse with Palestine in the Greek language ; and it is highly probable that the Imperial coinage was stamped in Greek (Matthew xxii. 19-21). Numbers of Hellenistic Jews, Jewish Proselytes, and even Gentiles (John xii. 20) came up to the temple. Indeed the Hellenists had their own synagogue in Jerusalem, and often settled residences there (Acts vi. 9, comp. ix. 29). And, as on the western borders of the country, Hellenistic Oriental heathenism was to some extent established, the Jewish people could not with its near neighbourhood remain ignorant of the Greek language, nor of Greek religion and practice. Nevertheless, in praise of the home-born Jews, it must be said that—of course



on the whole, and with certain exceptions set aside—they rigidly held aloof from heathenism, and adhered strictly to the belief and practice of their fathers. To prevent the least approach to idolatry the greatest possible stress was laid on the second of the ten commandments (Exodus xx. 4, 5), and no pictures or images of any sort or of any thing were permitted in the temple. The Jews were not even willing that the Roman ensigns bearing images of the emperor should be brought into Jerusalem.<sup>51</sup> Inter-course with the heathens, especially on the feast days, was strictly forbidden to the Jews; and also the use of wines made by heathens, and of wood from the groves in which idolatrous rites were practised. Any communication or contact with pagans was a source of defilement (Acts x. 28, John xviii. 28); and while a Jew might in case of need invite a heathen to his table, it was held to be quite illegal to sit by his side, to eat, or keep company with him (Acts xi. 3, Gal. ii. 12). The rule of pagan Rome was regarded as unlawful, and one of the most earnest questions of the period was whether it was right to pay tribute to Cæsar or not (Matt. xxii. 15-17, Mark xii. 13-17, Luke xx. 20-26). On the other hand it was a great joy to the Jew to make one heathen a proselyte to his religion (Matthew xxiii. 15).

In the time of Jesus, Palestine was no longer divided into the several districts which were once occupied by the twelve tribes; but three provinces were counted on this side the Jordan, Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee; and beyond the river lay Peræa, with Batanæa, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulonitis and Ituræa, adjoining it on the north. At the time when Jesus was born these provinces were all united

under one government by Herod the Great. In order to obtain a clear view of the country and people of Palestine we must describe these provinces more particularly.

The most southerly of the three provinces lying to the west of the Jordan was Judæa, called in the Scriptures "the land of Judæa" (John iii. 22, Luke ii, 4, Matt. ii. 1). It was to a large extent a hilly district (Luke i. 65); but the hills were fruitful, and there were many delightful valleys, as well as some rocky wildernesses. It was inhabited by the most pure Jewish race in Palestine, because this was the part of the country which at the return from captivity was first peopled again by the tribes of Benjamin and Judah, more especially the latter, for which reason it was named Judæa, and the whole people from that period were called Jews. After the death of Herod the Great, Archelaus inherited it; later it belonged to the Roman province of Syria, and was governed by procurators until the time of Agrippa I., who again united it with the other provinces under his sceptre.

The province of Judæa, and especially the capital city which was situated in it, was of the greatest consequence and importance to all Israel. Jerusalem is about twenty-four miles distant from the north shore of the Dead Sea, and about thirty-six miles from the sea-port of Joppa on the Mediterranean. It stands upon a piece of high and comparatively level table-land, encompassed on three sides by deep valleys; on the east by the valley of Jehoshaphat, through which the brook Kidron runs; on the west by the valley of Gihon, and on the south by that of Ben Hinnom, both traversed by the stream called Gihon, which runs into the Kidron. The city itself is



divided into two parts by the deep depression in the land called the Tyropœon. On the west side of this ravine stands the 'Upper City,' and the hill called Mount Zion; on the eastern side at a lower elevation is Mount Moriah, upon which the Temple was built; bounded on the south and west by these two divisions stands Acra, or the 'Lower City;' northward from Mount Moriah and Acra is the 'New City,' called Bezetha. In the time of Jesus two walls surrounded Jerusalem; the first, which was begun by David, enclosed Zion and the Temple mount; the second, which was built by Hezekiah, took in also a part of Acra. A third was erected by Herod Agrippa I., only thirty years before the destruction of the city, which encompassed Bezetha also.

Narrow lanes and wider streets, wretched hovels and splendid buildings, alternated with each other. Among the more important of the latter were the magnificent palace of Herod the Great in the north-west part of the Upper City; the theatre in the southern part of the same locality, erected by Herod the Great in opposition to the feelings and inherited customs of the Jews; the Xystus, a pillared court or colonnade, and the council-house, both of which were near the Temple. Some think that in the latter building the Sanhedrin, or high council of the nation, held their sittings, and that it was here that Jesus underwent his third examination, and was condemned; and that here also Paul afterwards had to stand and justify himself before the whole council (Acts xxii. 30, xxiii. 1, 10). But above all it was the Temple on Mount Moriah which kindled the enthusiasm and love of all Jewish hearts.<sup>52</sup> It had been rebuilt on a magnificent scale by Herod the

Great. He began this great work in the eighteenth year of his reign (B.C. 20), but owing to the vast extent of the labour and the cost, it was not till many years afterwards that the structure was finished. At the end of ten years however it was sufficiently complete to be solemnly dedicated for Divine Service.<sup>53</sup> From that period down to the date of the birth of Jesus, and all through his life-time, and until shortly before the destruction of both city and Temple, hosts of workmen were employed in perfecting and adorning it. Thus the Jews could truthfully say at our Lord's first Passover that the Temple had been "forty-six years in building," and it was not finished even then. Adjoining the Temple was the fortress of Antonia, which had been much enlarged and strengthened by Herod, who named it in honour of his friend the Roman general, Mark Antony. Here in all probability was the Prætorium, or "hall of judgment," (unless indeed they are right who think that it was in Herod's palace<sup>54</sup>), where Jesus was brought before Pilate (Mark xv. 16, John xviii. 28), and whence he was led by command of Pilate to appear before Herod at his palace in the Upper City, only to be sent back again and afterwards led forth to his crucifixion at Golgotha. The fortress was occupied by a strong Roman garrison, because it commanded the Temple and the city alike ; and it was hither that the Roman soldiers carried Paul whom they had seized in the midst of the uproar in the Temple court, thus rescuing him from the mob, who would soon have beaten him to death (Acts xxi. 31, 32).

To the east of Jerusalem, opposite the Temple mount and on the other side of the valley of Jehoshaphat, is the Mount of Olives, with Gethsemane lying at the foot of it,

on the side facing the City and near the brook Kidron. On a spur of the mountain, to the south of it, was the ancient Bethphage; and about a mile further on, on the road leading to Jericho, was the village of Bethany. Bethlehem was situated about six miles to the southward of the city. The supposed site of the village of Emmaus is about seven and a half miles in a north-westerly direction, but its true position has not been determined. Jericho was about fifteen miles from the City, on the north-eastern road.

Jerusalem itself, at the time of Jesus, presented a very lively scene of human activity and exertion. The migratory habits of the Jews, and the trade with their co-religionists abroad, must have contributed very largely to the life and stir of the city, especially at the times when the great feasts were held. Delitzsch, in his "Artizan Life in the Time of Jesus," and Pressel, in his "Priscilla to Sabina," have sketched for us a very lively picture of the aspect of affairs in particular spheres of activity, more particularly among the labouring classes. During the six working-days the city might have been compared to an enormous bee-hive, in which all is movement and industry. In the houses and in front of them sawing and hammering, slaughtering and cooking, weaving and washing,—all sorts of labour were carried on. Swarms of people from town and country crowded about the shops, open to the street, and along the rows of stalls, where meat and vegetables, bread and wine, clothes and shoes, as well as the finer productions, such as carpets and curtains, spices and perfumery, were to be purchased. Barbers' shops and bath-houses, wine-taverns, eating-houses, and the teaching-

rooms of Rabbis resounded with the confused medley of cheerful and earnest voices. Most trades and occupations might be carried on in the midst of the city, but some had their own localities. The potters were on the south side of the city, the fullers on the west side, and the tanners had their workshops still further off, outside the city. Business and professional life was regulated by strict order. The men of the various trades and businesses formed separate classes and unions among themselves, each being strictly bound by its own statutes and regulations. Labour was held in such high respect among the Jews that every scholar must follow some trade or occupation, and the plainest tradesman or mechanic might become an elder in the congregation, or indeed attain to a seat and a vote in the supreme council itself.

The religious life of the people was very manifest in the City. Not only the inhabitants of the promised land, but the scattered Jewish people from all parts of the world, came up to the Temple at the great festivals to serve the Lord in His house (Luke ii. 42, Acts ii. 8-11); so that it is thought as many as three million visitors may sometimes have been present on such occasions.<sup>55</sup> These Jewish pilgrims not only stimulated the religious life of the people, but also contributed large sums to the treasury of the Temple, and were the source of much profit to the inhabitants of the city. If, however, the strangers were always extremely numerous at the feasts, they were at all times coming and going, for there was never any end to the pilgrimages. In Jerusalem the Jew found what he most desired; besides the Temple, here were numerous Synagogues, in which the Law was read and expounded, and

common prayer was daily offered (Acts vi. 9) ; here were the institutions of learning in which the highest knowledge that Judaism had to impart was to be obtained ; and here was the Sanhedrin, the spiritual court of final appeal for the Jews of all the world. Jerusalem was the spot in which every nerve and fibre of Jewish life throbbed and pulsed.

In the country parts of Judæa life was of course much quieter. There the shepherds pastured their flocks, the herdsmen tended their cattle, and the husbandmen cultivated their fields and vineyards ; trade was naturally of secondary importance. Nevertheless, to the countryman also, “Jehovah and His Temple” were objects of the most sacred regard ; and one of his chief efforts was to imprint the Law which had been handed down to him upon the minds of the young, and to train them in its precepts. It must be said, however, along with much ceremonial piety, much superstition and disorder also existed among the people. Some did not shrink from deeds of violence, and were not above enriching themselves by plundering travellers. In war they were full of fanatical zeal ; and hence it was that Herod built some of his strongest fortresses to overawe the provincial Jews.

The life of Christ is very closely connected with Judæa. He was born in the little city of Bethlehem, lying a few miles to the south of Jerusalem. From the twelfth year of his age (Luke ii. 42) he was often in the capital city and its temple. St. John especially tells us of his journeys to the great festivals, and of his work in Jerusalem ; and, like the other Evangelists, describes what took place there at the time of his passion and death.

The middle province of the country, west of the Jordan, was called Samaria. It was a pleasant district of about one thousand square miles in extent, having many fertile meadows, and woods of oak, olive, and nut-trees. On the hills and sides of the mountains agriculture and cattle and sheep farming were carried on; near the western borders of the province there was a flourishing commerce, and the people were in active communication with foreign lands. Like Judæa this province was at first one of the dominions of Herod the Great, and afterwards of his son Archelaus, but in a few years it shared the fate of Judæa, and was made a part of the Roman province of Syria. The Samaritans were the descendants of that mixed race who were formed by the blending together of the Israelites who remained in the land when the great bulk of the people were carried into captivity, and those colonists who were transplanted into Palestine from the Assyrian provinces by Shalmaneser and Esarhaddon (Ezra iv. 2). These heathen immigrants by degrees associated themselves with the religious fellowship of the Jews (2 Kings xvii. 24-28). When the restoration took place the Samaritans would willingly have joined themselves with the returning exiles, and have taken part in the rebuilding of the Temple and the religious worship at Jerusalem (Ezra iv.); but the Jews repelled them, and in resentment for this rejection they did all they could to hinder the re-building of the Temple and the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah iv.) The bitterness between the two parties soon grew to open hostility, and the inhabitants of Samaria, under Sanballat and Manasseh, built their own temple to Jehovah on Mount Gerizim, near their chief city of Shechem<sup>56</sup>; after standing



two hundred years it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus. But although the Sanctuary had fallen, the spot continued even down to the time of Jesus to be, in the estimation of the Samaritans, the place where men ought to worship (John iv. 20). Their religion was an enfeebled Mosaism; they accepted as sacred records only the Pentateuch, and rejected all tradition and all pharisaical rules. Yet they also, as well as the Jews, expected a Messiah (John iv. 25), and it is well known that many of them became converts to Christianity (Acts viii. 5-12, ix. 31, xv. 3).

The Samaritans in general seem to have been more gentle in nature and character than the Jews. Our Lord does them full justice, and in the parable of the Good Samaritan has left a lasting monument of their humanity (Luke x. 30 and xvii. 16). But the old hatred between Jews and Samaritans was not yet extinct (John viii. 48). When Jews from other parts of the country had occasion to pass through Samaria, they often met with an unfriendly reception at the inns (Luke ix. 53); or the travellers were scoffed at, and sometimes involved in wrangles and fights.<sup>57</sup> For this reason, and because the Samaritans were held to be 'unclean' through their large admixture of heathen blood, all association with them was, as much as possible, avoided by the Jews. In order not to pass through Samaria on their journeys to the Temple, the Galileans often took a circuitous route—as Jesus himself sometimes did—generally through Peræa, along the plain of the Jordan on the eastern side, and by way of Jericho (Luke xix. 1); and as a rule the inhabitants of Judæa, on their part, did the same when they had occasion to travel to the north. This enmity between Jews and Samaritans is, of



course, the explanation of the question which the woman put to Jesus at Jacob's well : "How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria?" (John iv. 9); and of the surprise of the disciples that the Master should be found talking with her (John iv. 27). That Jesus did not share the common Jewish prejudice is shown by his journeys through the midst of Samaria (Luke xvii. 11), and his sending forth his disciples as preachers of the gospel into this very district, after the Pentecost (Acts i. 8).

Lying to the north of Samaria was the province of Galilee, which was divided into two districts, Upper and Lower Galilee. Upper Galilee, "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Matthew iv. 15) is a wild and rugged district, where in the most diversified manner mountains and valleys alternate with each other; a country that was almost impassable, and whose interior was therefore avoided as much as possible by the great trading routes. Far more favourable than this region for cultivation and travel was the so-called Lower Galilee, which lay to the south of it, and may be said to have begun at the road called the *via maris*, which ran from Accho (St. Jean d'Acre) to Capernaum on the Sea of Tiberias, where Matthew sat at the "receipt of custom." It is less elevated than Upper Galilee, and characterized by a range of large table-lands, which succeed one another somewhat in the form of terraces, and with more or less steepness fall off towards the east and south. Galilee belonged to the more fertile portions of Palestine, and was rich in excellent agricultural land, in verdant meadows and forests of oaks, carob trees (St. John's bread), and mulberry trees. The most

beautiful and charming part of it was undoubtedly the strip of country lying along the western shore of the Sea of Galilee—the ‘Sea of Tiberias,’ or the ‘Lake of Genesaret,’ as it is variously called—a district where all kinds of corn produced plentiful crops, and where figs, grapes, and other fruits could be gathered during ten months of the year without cessation.

After the death of Herod the Great, Galilee was governed by Herod Antipas, who was succeeded by Agrippa I. ; but, like Judæa and Samaria, it was in a short time united with the Roman province of Syria.

Its Jewish population after the captivity was largely intermixed with heathen elements, whence the name ‘Galilee of the Gentiles ;’ and even at the time of Jesus it contained large numbers of Phenicians, Arabians, Syrians, and Greeks. The total number of inhabitants was very great, and Josephus<sup>58</sup> counts two hundred and four Galilean townships, of which the smallest is said to have had a population of more than fifteen thousand. The industrious and energetic people were chiefly occupied in agriculture and trade with neighbouring countries. Josephus was able to boast that Galilee was never deficient in men, that the men were never wanting in courage, and that cowardice was never a characteristic of Galileans ;<sup>59</sup> but they were much given to change, and fond of sedition and tumult (compare Luke xiii. 1, Acts v. 37). If the people, moreover, were loyal to the Temple, and regularly went up in great numbers to the feasts at Jerusalem (Luke ii. 44), they were at the same time more independent in matters of religion than the inhabitants of Judæa. The Pharisees had less influence in Galilee than

in Judæa, although some of them occasionally went to the north as missionaries (Matthew xv. 1). Owing to his corrupt provincial dialect, the Galilean was always known by his speech ; and hence when Peter denied his Master, they that stood by said, "Thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto" (Mark xiv. 70). On account of their inferior education, and also because of their intercourse with the heathens, which exposed them to the charge of 'uncleanness,' the Galileans were despised by the rest of the Jews (compare John i. 46, vii. 52 ; Acts ii. 7).

The great distinction of this province was that Jesus was of Galilee (Matthew xxvi. 69). In Nazareth the boy Jesus grew up, and here was the home of that wonderful childhood (John iv. 44, Matthew ii. 23). His disciples were mostly Galileans (Acts i. 11, ii. 7) ; at Cana in Galilee he wrought his first miracle (John ii.) ; and at the gate of Nain, another Galilean city, he restored a dead son to his sorrowing mother (Luke vii. 11). In Capernaum, on the Lake of Gennesaret, he dwelt often and gladly, so that it is called "his own city" (Matthew ix. 1) ; and altogether he seems to have loved the charming district on the west side of the Galilean Lake, and made it the scene of "most of his mighty works" (Matthew xi. 20). The three first evangelists have much to tell us about his words and deeds in this region.

The districts of Palestine lying east of the Jordan were far inferior to those we have described. The country there had not the natural beauties, nor the soil the productiveness of the other provinces. The rugged and unfruitful Peræa contained but few inhabitants, and was

of value chiefly as a barrier against the Arabians. It was with an eye to the latter advantage that Herod the Great and Herod Antipas erected the strong fortress of Machærus, in which it is probable that John the Baptist met his tragical fate (Matthew xiv. 3). The broad northern section of the country east of the Jordan formed the districts called Gaulonitis, Auranitis, Trachonitis, Ituræa, and Batanæa. This region contained a good deal of inferior agricultural land, some extensive grazing grounds, and a large number of caves. The inhabitants were rude and uncultivated, and loved to spend their lives as a warlike and nomadic race, without fixed dwelling places or settled occupation of the land.

They often engaged in marauding expeditions, and concealed their booty in the extensive rocky caverns, which were at the same time a refuge for themselves from their enemies. Herod marched against them, and was able in some degree to reduce them to order by the power of the sword and by settling Jewish and Idumean colonists among them. Everywhere in these districts the Jewish population was numerous, but was largely intermixed with Syrian and Greek elements, and these were only held in connection with Judæa by Herod's government. After his death Peræa, with Galilee, formed the dominion of Herod Antipas, and shared the fate of the latter province; the northern districts were made the dominions of Herod Philip, and at a later period became the possessions of Agrippa I.

Such was the country and such the people in whose midst our Lord lived. If Rome was the centre of the political dominion of the world, Palestine was the land

from which the life and power of religion was to go forth to all the nations. As a State, at the time of Jesus, it was dependent on Rome ; its princes were but vassals of the supreme authority ; the time soon came when the government was more immediately administered by Roman officials, and at last the Roman sword deprived the land of its relative independence. Hence we have next to consider the political condition of the country, and in order that we may have a clear understanding of the state of affairs in the time of Jesus, we must go back somewhat in its history.

---

## II.

### THE POLITICAL GOVERNMENT OF PALESTINE.

AFTER the death of Alexander the Great (B.C. 323) Palestine remained under the mild and peaceful rule of the Ptolemies, kings of Egypt, down to the year 203. But when the Syrians, under Antiochus the Great (died B.C. 187), had wrested the country from the kingdom of Egypt, the Jews were cruelly oppressed. Antiochus himself was humane ; but his son and successor, Seleucus Philopater (died B.C. 175), to supply himself with money, ordered the Temple at Jerusalem to be plundered of its treasures ; and Antiochus Epiphanes (died B.C. 164) made use of the most atrocious means to compel the Jews to deny their religion and adopt in place of it Greek pagan-

ism. In this time of violent persecution and distress the Jewish Priest Mattathias, of the race of the Asmoneans, with his five brave sons and a multitude of Jews filled with the same spirit, revolted against the tyrant. After the death of the father (B.C. 166) his eldest son, Judas Maccabeus,<sup>60</sup> in a rapid series of victories, succeeded in driving back the Syrians and restoring the worship of Jehovah in the Temple. At length, after many vicissitudes of fortune, and after the death of Judas (B.C. 160), and his brother Jonathan (B.C. 143), Simon, the third brother, was able to capture Mount Zion, which had been still held by the Syrians, and to secure for his people religious and political freedom (B.C. 141). In gratitude to the Maccabees the people decreed that the hereditary rank of Prince and High Priest should belong to him and his descendants, "until there should arise a faithful prophet" (I. Maccabees xiv. 41). When Simon had been treacherously murdered by his son-in-law Ptolemeus at a banquet in Jericho (B.C. 135), he was succeeded by his son John Hyrcanus (B.C. 135-105), who not only made himself entirely independent of Syria, but by the conquest of Idumea and Samaria greatly enlarged the Jewish territory and gained great distinction for his country. His son and successor, Aristobulus I. (B.C. 105-104) assumed the title of king, but it was under him that the decline of the Jewish State began. The spirit of the first Maccabees was lost: internal conflicts and quarrels, the worldliness of the princely family and the people, and wars with neighbouring countries slowly brought on the end. After the turbulent reigns of Alexander Jannæus, the brother of Aristobulus I. (B.C. 104-



78), and his consort Alexandra, who succeeded him (B.C. 78—69), their two sons, Aristobulus II. (died B.C. 49) and Hyrcanus II. (died B.C. 30)—the nephews of Aristobulus I.—contended for the supremacy, and both of them sent ambassadors to the Roman Pompey, at that time in Damascus, requesting him to decide between them. Pompey promised to come to Jerusalem himself. Aristobulus, fearing some evil design, prepared for resistance. But Pompey conquered Jerusalem on a Sabbath day, threw down the walls of the city, and entered the Temple; leaving the treasury, however, untouched, and even taking measures for the undisturbed continuance of Divine Service (B.C. 63). He made the weak Hyrcanus II. High Priest and civil governor, but under tribute to Rome and over a much reduced territory. Aristobulus was carried to Rome to grace the conqueror's triumph (B.C. 61).<sup>61</sup> Henceforth the liberties of the Jews were lost, and the country became a feudal State under the Roman Empire.

After a few years of peace the country was several times thrown into an uproar by Alexander the son of Aristobulus, by Aristobulus himself, who had escaped from Rome, and by his other son Antigonus; but their efforts to obtain power were all in vain. During this time (B.C. 63-40) Hyrcanus II. bore the title of High Priest; but as a matter of fact the clever and energetic Idumean Antipater had managed to get the control of things into his own hands; and indeed Julius Cæsar had recognized his services by making him coadjutor to Hyrcanus, and transferring to him an important share of the government with the title of procurator of Judæa (B.C. 47). Soon



afterwards Antipater nominated his sons Phasael and Herod as commandants of Judæa and Galilee. When Cæsar, who had won the good-will of the Jews by various favours, had been murdered in the year B.C. 44, and Antipater a year later had shared the same fate, the younger son Herod held at first with Cassius, and after his death (B.C. 42) with Antony, and as a reward was made by the latter Tetrarch of Judæa. Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus II., now bestirred himself again, and at the head of a Parthian army invaded Palestine. Herod made good his escape, but Hyrcanus and Phasael fell into the hands of the victor. The first had his ears cut off, in order that being mutilated he might be incapable of again taking the office of High Priest, and the second dashed out his own brains against the wall of his prison. Thus Antigonus got possession of the reins of government (B.C. 40-37); but during his short rule Herod was not inactive. He betook himself to Rome, and there laid his complaints before Antony, and as a result was by his influence, with the consent of Octavius, appointed by the Senate "King of Judæa" (B.C. 40). With the help of the Roman legions he first subdued Galilee, and in the year B.C. 37 conquered Jerusalem, and thus obtained actual possession of his dominion. Antigonus was by command of Antony put to death at Antioch (B.C. 37).

Herod, called "The Great," was king of Judæa from the year 37 to 4 before the Christian era, and it was in his reign that Jesus was born (Matthew ii. 1). The first years of his reign (B.C. 37-25) were passed in endeavours to consolidate and secure his kingdom. The people endured him reluctantly as a half-foreign prince who had

been forced upon them by the power of the Romans. The Pharisees especially earnestly exerted themselves against him ; but Herod did not shrink from scenes of bloodshed, and forty-five of the most eminent men in the country were executed. At the same time he won over some of the more docile among the people, by bestowing favours upon them. The most horrible crime which stained the first period of his reign was his murder of his wife's relations, by which he put an end to the Asmonean race. The tragedy opened with the death of Aristobulus III. Since Hyrcanus II., who had returned from captivity, was ineligible for the office of High Priest through being maimed, Herod had raised to that dignity a certain Ananeel, a member of the priestly family. But Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus II. and mother of Herod's consort Mariamne, successfully used her influence to have Ananeel deposed from office, and her son, the young Aristobulus, the grandson of Hyrcanus, appointed in his place, according to ancient hereditary right. When, at the next feast of Tabernacles (B.C. 35), the youthful High Priest stood up before the assembled people, and was greeted with enthusiastic cheers, Herod recognized in him his most dangerous rival ; and his death was now a foregone conclusion. Only a few days later the king and the High Priest were together guests of Alexandra in Jericho. When Aristobulus, after the repast, was with others taking a bath, Herod's friends, under the pretence of a practical joke, held him forcibly so long under the water that he was drowned. Accused of this murder before Antony, Herod was acquitted, but had scarcely returned from Rome when he caused his uncle Joseph, whom he accused

of improper conduct with Mariamne, to be executed, without even hearing him in his own defence. The harmless Hyrcanus, now eighty years of age, was not spared (B.C. 30); and even the passionately-loved Mariamne herself fell a victim to his suspicion (B.C. 29). His mother-in-law Alexandra soon met with the same fate (B.C. 28). And when at last (B.C. 25) he discovered concealed with his brother-in-law Costobarus, husband of his sister Salome, the sons of Babas, distant relations of the Asmonean family, whom he had long sought for in vain, he had them put to death and their protector with them, and now felt secure in the certainty that no Asmonean would endanger his possession of the throne.

To these domestic miseries was added disaster from without. Herod was compelled to give up to Cleopatra, queen of Egypt—who exercised a controlling influence over her admirer and his patron, Antony—a valuable part of his dominions, the fertile district of Jericho. And, as if this were not enough, he was obliged to collect the tribute money in the lost province, and deliver it to the queen, who also involved him in a war with the Arabians, from which he only returned victorious after many disasters (B.C. 31).

The fall of his patron Antony, who was completely overthrown in the battle of Actium (B.C. 31), seemed to be the crowning misfortune of Herod's life, and left him in the hands of the victor, the all-powerful Octavius. But with the cleverness which was natural to him, he succeeded in making a friend of Octavius on the island of Rhodes. Not only did the new patron confirm him in his kingdom, but greatly enlarged it by the restoration of the

province which he had been compelled to abdicate in favour of Cleopatra, and the addition of the sea-ports from Gaza to Cæsarea, besides Gadara, Hippos, and the city of Samaria in the interior. After his dominions had been still further enlarged and completed, the limits of Judæa extended further than they have ever done before or since—from the Mediterranean Sea to Syria, and from Damascus to Egypt.

Herod was now at the height of his power, and the next twelve years of his reign were a period of prosperity at home and quietness abroad, which he knew how to make use of, not only to establish himself in the favour of Augustus, but also to imitate him in the great works of peace. By a series of magnificent public works he gave Palestine an Augustan age. He erected a theatre in Jerusalem, where hitherto only sacrifice and prayer had attracted men; and outside the city a Roman amphitheatre of enormous circumference. War games in honour of the emperor were introduced; Roman gladiators, charioteers, and players filled the city which had been consecrated to God; wild beasts were brought in to enhance the attractions of the festive combats. He fortified the citadel of Antonia, and built for himself a magnificent palace in the upper city. When he had finished these great works in Jerusalem, he made a fortified place of the ancient city of Samaria, built a temple in it, and decreed that henceforth it should be called Sebaste, (that is, Augusta,) in honour of the emperor. With the same object in view he gave the name of Cæsarea to the stately city which he built up around Strato's Tower, on the Mediterranean. It occupied twelve years in building, had

a noble harbour, and was adorned with a theatre, amphitheatre, temples, and statues of the emperor. Many other places owed to Herod their rise into importance, their enlargement or adornment. His munificence was not confined to his own dominion. In Damascus, Antioch, Sidon, and even in Greece, great architectural works, temples, theatres, galleries and aqueducts were erected or restored either at his cost or by his liberal support. More important, however, than all his other works at home and abroad, was the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem (John ii. 20),<sup>62</sup> in comparison with which that of Zerubabel, and even the famous one built by Solomon, appeared poor and insignificant. Thousands of priests, instructed in the arts of building, laboured at the 'holy place' (B.C. 20-19), and after about two years the interior was so far restored that religious worship could be uninterruptedly carried on. In another eight years the colonnades and courts were so much advanced that the House of God was solemnly dedicated amid great festivities and loud rejoicing among the Jews. The glory of the building—on which much labour was yet to be bestowed, so that the work lasted for another ten years, and indeed almost down to the destruction of Jerusalem—was much celebrated, and the Jews of that time were wont to say: "Whoever has not seen Herod's Temple, has not seen anything beautiful."

The outward splendour of Herod's rule gave him great influence with Augustus, and won for the king the high favour of the emperor. But notwithstanding his restoration of the Temple and other favours, he could not win the goodwill of his Jewish subjects, who endured his rule

only reluctantly and with hatred against himself. They not only knew that they themselves would have to bear the expense of so much building in their own country and beyond its borders, at the cost of heavy sacrifices, but they saw at the same time that the ancient customs of their fathers were threatened by innovations, and their national religion by the Pagan purposes for which many of the buildings were designed. Thus there was general discontent and much murmuring over the introduction of foreign and heathen practices, the contempt of traditional laws and the changes made in them, the capricious and arbitrary setting up and deposition of High Priests—over the enormous taxation and prodigal expenditure of revenue in and out of the kingdom, and the terrible severity of the king against his opponents. Herod did not conceal from himself that he by no means enjoyed the entire favour and confidence of his people. He was constantly surrounded by a numerous body-guard; spies everywhere reported to him any hostile movement; fortresses to overawe the people were built in Jerusalem and other places; the discontented and complaining were imprisoned, and large numbers of them sentenced to death. It was of no avail when Herod, once in a while, in a time of scarcity, procured supplies from Egypt and distributed provisions among the people, or at another time felt himself compelled to remit the taxes. If he thus succeeded in pacifying the discontent of his people and earning their gratitude, it was only for a short time. Their enmity soon returned and impelled them to serious conspiracies against him, like that in the year B.C. 25, when only the treachery of one of the conspirators saved him from the dagger of the assassin.



Suspicious and cruel as he always was, he showed himself especially so in the last ten years of his reign. The whole people, and particularly the members of his own family, suffered under his terrible oppression. To the numerous victims of the Maccabean race were now added his own sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, the children of his wife Mariamne. Antipater, his eldest son by his former wife Doris, slandered his step-brothers, accusing them of wishing to avenge upon Herod the death of their mother. The king was suspicious enough to believe the evil words of Antipater and the lies of the court people whom the accuser had won over, and who were constantly inventing new reports. Accusations and reconciliations now alternated with each other ; but the instigations and calumnies in the king's palace did not cease, and the end of the tragedy was the strangulation of Alexander and Aristobulus at Sebaste (B.C. 7), in the very place where, thirty-two years before, the marriage of Herod and their mother had been celebrated. Augustus at that time is said to have remarked : "It is better to be Herod's swine than his son."

But the tale of bloodshed was not yet complete. A multitude of Pharisees, with some of the courtiers who had conspired against the king in favour of his brother, were put to death. Two learned men who, believing that the king, who had now become sick, was near his end, had caused the golden eagles which he had set up over the gate of the Temple to be pulled down by some of their disciples, were burnt alive, and their disciples also executed. To all this must be added the terrible story of the massacre of the children in Bethlehem (Matthew ii.



16-18), a fact of which it is not surprising to find no mention anywhere else, since among the evil deeds of Herod it would vanish like a drop in the sea. A host of little children might easily be sacrificed in a small country town like Bethlehem without much notice being taken of it. At last the slanderer, Antipater, who had not scrupled to poison the mind of his father, deservedly shared the fate of his brothers. The disease of the king grew worse every day ; but all in Jerusalem still trembled at the commands of the furious dying man, who was determined that tears of anger should flow at his death, since he well knew that no tears of sorrow and sympathy would be shed for him. Only the death of the madman which took place five days after the execution of Antipater, set the people free from this reign of terror. Herod died of a horrible disease, about the beginning of April, four years before the account called the Christian era, when he was seventy years of age.

It must be admitted that Herod possessed a clear understanding, great energy and valour, a terrible consistency, and an iron will. He certainly also showed some care for the Jewish people, which was manifest in times of distress, or when he interceded with Augustus for the Jews who were dispersed abroad. By his energy he suppressed brigandage, especially in the east. His architectural undertakings had in view not only the useful but also the beautiful. In his policy he exhibited great wisdom and breadth of view, which almost always enabled him to make his way favourably and gain his ends. If for these reasons and for his great achievements he deserved to be called "the Great," in the good sense, it is equally certain, on the other hand, that he was great in

evil. His measureless ambition, which pressed on to the desired end, regardless of everything else ; his tyranny towards all classes of the people and his own family ; his unbounded suspiciousness of all the world, high and low, and especially of his own blood-relations ; his unsparing rage and cruelty towards his opponents, and his lax views of religion, which were favourable to heathenism and far from being sincere religiousness—all marked him out as a king whose greatness was a terror to his people. Only in explanation, and not in exculpation, can reference be made to the corruption of the times in which he lived, the evil example of Rome, the critical condition of the Jewish people, the divisions and contentions in his family, and—with respect to the last occurrences of his reign—his age and his terrible affliction.

It was only after much disturbance and bloodshed that Herod's testament could be sustained and carried out. but under it his son Archelaus got for his dominions as ethnarch, with the sanction of the emperor, the provinces of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumea.<sup>63</sup> His brother Herod Antipas became tetrach of Galilee and Peræa ; and Philip, another brother, tetrach of the other provinces lying to the north of the country east of the Jordan.<sup>64</sup>

Archelaus, born about B.C. 21, had been very badly educated in Rome, and was an arrogant, tyrannical, unjust, and prodigal man. His rule, which he exercised from Jericho, was full of oppression, sensuality, and arbitrariness, and only lasted from B.C. 4 to A.D. 6. He created great scandal by putting away his wife Mariamne, in order to marry Claphyra, the profligate widow of his brother Alexander who had been executed. Like his

father, he installed or deposed High Priests at his pleasure or caprice. Every year of his rule was full of injustice and abuse. At last all joined in one general complaint against him to the emperor, who summoned him to Rome in his tenth year of office, to answer for his misdeeds. The result was that he was now banished to Vienna in Gallia (A.D. 6), his property was confiscated, and his tetrarchy made a part of the Roman province of Syria.

Judæa was now ruled by procurators, who were subordinate to the imperial governor of Syria. The procurators had the chief command of the troops quartered in Palestine; the financial management of their districts was in their hands; and it was their duty to administer justice, except in so far as this was the function of the Sanhedrin, which was especially the case in religious questions. It was theirs also to pass sentence of death, or to confirm those passed by the Sanhedrin (John xviii. 31).<sup>65</sup> They generally resided in Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 23-25),<sup>66</sup> but frequently visited the Capital, especially at the times of the great festivals, when it was necessary to take precautions against disorders among the crowds flocking into the city. On such occasions they resided in the former palace of Herod, or at the Prætorium<sup>67</sup> (Matthew xxvii. 27, Mark xv. 16, John xviii. 28).

Of the seven procurators who governed Judæa from A.D. 6 to 41, we know little more than their names. After Coponius (about A.D. 6-9), the first procurator, came Marcus Ambivius, who only held the office till A.D. 12; he was followed by Annius Rufus (A.D. 12-15), Valerius Gratus (15-26), Pontius Pilate (26-36), Marcellus (36-37), and Marullus (37-41).<sup>68</sup> Immediately after Judæa was

placed under the government of Roman officials, Quirinus, who in the time of Coponius was governor of Syria, took measures to carry out the general taxing, mentioned in Luke ii.<sup>69</sup>; one result of which was an insurrection of the people under Judas, the Gaulonite or Galilean (Acts v. 37). After this time it is probable that the patriotic party formed the sect of the "Zealots,"<sup>70</sup> who struggled desperately against Rome.<sup>71</sup>

Among all the procurators, the best known and, for Christians, the most important is Pontius Pilate. In his days John the Baptist arose, and Jesus lived and died. Philo describes him<sup>72</sup> as obstinate, hard, and implacable in character. He charges him with corruption, outrage, continual executions without judgment, and other crimes and abominable cruelties. There was undoubtedly much truth at the bottom of these accusations. In the New Testament Pilate appears before us as inconsistent, wavering and unjust. Among the incidents of his official life that have come down to us from other sources, it is related that he aroused the indignation of the Jews by ordering the Roman soldiers to enter the city of Jerusalem with the standards bearing the image of the emperor. The people besought him all one day to remove the heathen symbols, and at last, when even force and threats of death availed nothing against the crowd, he was obliged to yield to their will.<sup>73</sup> It appears from Luke xiii. 1, that on another occasion Pilate put to death some Galileans while they were sacrificing, and "mingled their blood with their offerings." And Mark, as well as Luke, when relating the release of Barabbas, tells us of an insurrection in the city, in which murder was committed, but we know nothing more

definite of these occurrences. At a later time Pilate sought to mortify the Jews by setting up some votive shields, inscribed with the name of the emperor, in the palace at Jerusalem; but at the solicitation of the most important inhabitants, the emperor Tiberius ordered their removal from the Jewish capital, and their erection in Cæsarea.<sup>74</sup> When, at last, Pilate cruelly ill-treated the Samaritans, who had assembled on Mount Gerizim—to view the sacred vessels which, it was said, had been concealed there from the time of Moses—and killed some of them, the people of that province petitioned Vitellius, the governor of Syria, Pilate's superior, against him, and obtained his removal from office (A.D. 36).<sup>75</sup> Marcellus and Marullus were the last of the seven Roman governors of Judæa (A.D. 41).

Philip, another son of Herod the Great—from B.C. 4 to A.D. 34, tributary prince of the north-eastern territory including Batanæa, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulonitis, Baniyas, and Ituræa (Luke iii. 1)—was about the same age as Archelaus, but stood morally far higher than that prince and Herod Antipas. His rule was a peaceful one, and continued to his death. Two of his public works deserve to be mentioned. He enlarged and beautified the city of Panias, at the foot of Lebanon, and re-named it Cæsarea, with the addition of Philippi, to connect it with himself and to distinguish it from the other Cæsarea, on the Mediterranean. To this city, as we read, Jesus once journeyed (Matthew xvi. 13, Mark viii. 27). He also transformed the village of Bethsaida, situated to the north-east of the Sea of Tiberias, into the city of Julias, so called in honour of the daughter of Octavius, of the same

name. He devoted himself to the good of his provinces, and ruled so beneficently and righteously that his people loved him, and nothing was heard of opposition or rebellion. In his private life he was plain and simple in his habits. His marriage with Salome, the daughter of Herodias, was a childless one. He died in the year A.D. 34, at Julias, where, with every sign of respect and love, he was buried. His provinces, like those of Archelaus, were now annexed to the Roman province of Syria.

The last of the Herodian princes, of whom we have to tell, is Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa from B.C. 4 to A.D. 39, and often mentioned in the New Testament simply as 'Herod.' It was to his jurisdiction that Jesus himself belonged (Luke xxiii. 7). He was, in almost every respect, a genuine scion of Herod the Great—ambitious, clever, and fond of display; although he had not so much strength of will and courage as his father. Jesus characterizes him as "that fox" (Luke xiii. 32), and warns his disciples against his influence as 'leaven,' of course in a bad sense (Mark viii. 15). This prince also sought to make himself famous by great public works. He rebuilt, on a larger scale, the city of Sepphoris, which had been burnt by the soldiers of Varus; he fortified Betharamphtha, a town to the east of Jordan, for the protection of Peræa, and called it Livias, after the consort of Augustus; and he founded an entirely new city as the capital of Galilee, on the western shore of the lake of Gennesaret, and called it Tiberias, in honour of the new emperor, whose favour he sought further to gain by changing the name of the lake itself to "the Sea of Tiberias." At the time of the great feasts he seems to



have been often present in Jerusalem (Luke xxiii. 7), where he may have taken part in the appeal which the people made to the emperor against Pilate. On the occasion of a visit to the house of his step-brother Herod Philip, *not* the tetrarch,<sup>76</sup> who was living as a private individual, he induced the latter's wife, the beautiful and ambitious Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, who had been executed, to be unfaithful to her husband, although he (Herod Antipas) was fifty years of age, and she was forty, and had long been the mother of Salome, who, later on, was married to Philip the tetrarch.<sup>77</sup> In order to marry her, he wished to put away his own wife, a daughter of the Arabian king Aretas, to whom he had been married for many years, and who, having heard of her husband's infidelity, now fled to her father. John the Baptist was beheaded because he courageously told Herod Antipas that it was not lawful that he should have his brother's wife. In the gloomy fortress of Machærus he fell a victim to the vengeance of Herodias, and perhaps also to Herod's fear of a political and religious rising through him.

When, at a later period, Herod Antipas heard of Jesus, he believed him to be John the Baptist risen from the dead (Matthew xiv. 1, 2), and had a great desire to see him (Luke ix. 9), but soon sought secretly to put him to death (Luke xiii. 31). It was not till Pilate sent Jesus to Herod to have his case decided by him, as tetrarch of Galilee—to which province Jesus belonged—that Herod had any personal acquaintance with Jesus. Notwithstanding his character and his crimes, he had many partizans. In the New Testament they are called Herodians (Mat-



thew xxii. 16, Mark iii. 6), by which term we must understand not merely the servants of Herod, but, as Josephus describes them, "the people who supported Herod's cause."<sup>78</sup> With him they maintained, at least outwardly, a friendly attitude towards the Romans. This is the explanation of the particular question which on one occasion they put to Jesus,—whether it was right to pay tribute to Cæsar or not; by which they hoped to entrap him into giving an answer hostile to Rome (Mark xii. 16).

Towards the end of his reign, about A.D. 36, Herod was involved in a war with Aretas, the causes of which were a dispute about their frontier, and, more especially, his behaviour to his former wife. Aretas completely defeated him,<sup>79</sup> and the people saw in this disaster the righteous punishment of his faithlessness towards his wife, and his murder of John the Baptist.

In the meantime, Agrippa I., the brother of Herodias and the son of the murdered Aristobulus (B.C. 7), had at Rome found means of ingratiating himself with the emperor Caligula; and his imperial benefactor, as a proof of his favour, granted him, with the title of king, all the possessions of the deceased Philip, tetrarch of Ituræa, etc. As soon as Herod Antipas heard of this, misled by the ambitious Herodias, he petitioned the emperor for the same royal title. But the charge brought against him by Agrippa I., of being a rebel against Rome, was sufficient to ruin him, and instead of a king's crown he received sentence of banishment to Lugdunum in Gallia, whither Herodias followed him.

Herod Antipas being thus deposed, Agrippa I. obtained, in addition to his eastern provinces, the tetrarchy of

Galilee and Peræa (A.D. 40); and when the emperor Claudius had entered on his rule (A.D. 41), he obtained also the government of Judæa and Samaria, which up till then had been administered by procurators. And thus once again all the former possessions of Herod the Great were united under one crowned head (A.D. 41-44). This prince, who had led a restless and adventurous life, distinguished himself, in the days of his power, by his piety and observance of the Pharisaical principles, his benevolence, and affability. He lost no opportunity of exhibiting to the Jews his disposition to favour their nation. In order to please them he became the persecutor of the little band of Christians. Under him the elder James (Acts xii. 2) was executed, and Peter was thrown into prison, from which he only escaped by the miraculous help of God. After a short reign this king died suddenly and miserably at Cæsarea (A.D. 44), where, after some festivities held in honour of the emperor, he permitted himself to be worshipped as a god (Acts xii. 19).<sup>50</sup>

After his death, the whole country of Palestine was again made a province of the Roman Empire, administered by procurators in subordination to the governor of Syria. Antonius Felix (A.D. 52-60) was the fourth of them, and Porcius Festus (60-62), before whom Paul had to defend himself against the charges of the Jews (Acts xxv.) was the fifth. In the year A.D. 50, Agrippa II.—son of Agrippa I.—obtained the little dominion of Chalcis on Lebanon. Three years later he received the title of king, and along with it the former territory of Philip, to which, under Nero, were added portions of Peræa and Galilee, including the city of Tiberias. When, at Cæsarea, Agrippa

II., with his sister Berenice, paid a visit of respect to Festus, he had the prisoner Paul brought before him, and heard him speak in his own defence (Acts xxv. 22). Agrippa, who was always loyal to Rome, remained in possession of his kingdom till his death, about A.D. 100.

For many years discontent and anger against the Roman rule and its oppressions was stirring in all Jewish hearts ; from time to time the fire of rebellion threatened to burst into flames ; and indeed isolated outbreaks had taken place frequently. From the time of Felix the internal disorder, lawlessness, and resistance against Rome spread more and more. Gessius Florus was the last, and also the worst of the procurators (A.D. 64-66) ; his tyranny was measureless ; he plundered whole cities and ruined entire communities. The ferment among the people increased, and soon the flames of insurrection blazed forth (A.D. 66). The governor of Syria, Cestius Gallus, marched against the Jews, but was compelled to retreat before their superior strength, leaving valuable war materials in their hands. The rebellion was now systematically organized, so as to be able to cope effectually with a larger Roman army. In the year A.D. 67 the emperor Nero sent Vespasian into Palestine at the head of about 60,000 men. Favoured by internal disputes among the Jews, he had already conquered Galilee, and was about to press forward into Judæa and to the conquest of Jerusalem, when the death of Nero (A.D. 68) was announced in Palestine. Vespasian now adopted a policy of delay and waiting ; but after the short reign of Galba, and the subsequent elevation of Vitellius, he himself was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers. Vitellius soon met with his end by assas-

sination, and Vespasian now—in the spring of A.D. 70—repaired to Rome as emperor, leaving the completion of the war to his son Titus. The latter advanced to the siege of Jerusalem, and completely invested it at Easter A.D. 70, at a time when the city was full of visitors, and when internal party struggles divided the population. After a desperate and obstinate resistance on the part of the Jews, the Romans took, one after another, the New City, the Lower City, and the fortress of Antonia. The most horrible distress and suffering now prevailed among the besieged ; hunger raged more and more, and if a few individuals ventured out of the city to seek for food they were seized by the Romans and impaled on crosses, or mutilated and hurled back over the walls. When all demands for the surrender of Jerusalem proved unavailing, the Romans proceeded to storm the Temple. The gates of the forecourt were destroyed by fire ; the holy place itself was to have been spared at the express wish of Titus himself ; but on the ninth of the month Ab, or about our August, a Roman soldier threw a burning torch into the Temple.<sup>81</sup> Titus gave the order that the fire should be extinguished, but his word, although heard at first, was afterwards, in the fury of the battle, disregarded, and the noble building perished in the flames. Those who fell into the hands of the Romans were slaughtered ; neither age nor sex nor rank were spared. At last the Upper City, which had been vainly defended by Simon Bar-Giora and John of Giscala, was taken also (on the 8th of Elul, that is about our September), and thus the whole city was occupied by the Romans. The end of Jerusalem was to be razed to the ground. The people

who had not perished by famine and sword, nor escaped by flight, were, some of them, sold into captivity, or sent to work in the mines ; others were destined for the gladiatorial combats ; and the finest and most powerful men were reserved to grace the triumph of Titus.

The few other strong places of the country which now remained unsubdued, were taken about the beginning of the year A.D. 73. With their fall the Jewish State came to an end ; the land devastated by war became for the most part a desolate waste ; the population was absolutely decimated.

But the Jews, although immeasurably enfeebled, did not even now give up their cause. And although the inhabitants of Palestine were not able so soon to offer any resistance, the Jewish population of Cyrene and Egypt rose against the Roman rule in the time of the emperor Trajan (A.D. 115-117), and were followed by the Jews on the island of Cyprus and those of Mesopotamia. It was not till much blood had been shed that the Romans succeeded in quelling these risings, and full quietness was only restored under Hadrian (A.D. 117).

The first fifteen years of Hadrian's reign were passed in peace and order. The emperor showed himself lenient and friendly towards the Jews, and even gave permission for the rebuilding of the Temple. Afterwards, however, he changed his mind, and ordered that the Temple should be dedicated to Jupiter, that circumcision should be abolished, and that the city to be newly built should be called *Ælia Capitolina*. This was more than the Jews could bear, and a terrible revolt broke out. Simon, called Barcochba, ("son of a star," Numbers xxiv. 17), who set him-

self up as the Messiah, took the lead of the insurrection, and it soon spread over all Palestine. The struggle lasted for three and a half years (A.D. 132-135), but the end was the entire subjugation of the Jewish people. They never again recovered their independence, and have been ever since scattered among all nations—a people without a country and without a Temple. Jerusalem was now actually called *Ælia Capitolina*; heathen colonists were settled in it; heathen temples arose, a heathen form of government was introduced, and the Jews were forbidden to enter the city on pain of death.

Antonius Pius (A.D. 138-161), it is true, allowed the Jews to practice circumcision; and after the death of Constantine (A.D. 337) they were again permitted to enter Jerusalem; but, from that day to this, Palestine has never been a Jewish country, nor Jerusalem a Jewish capital city.

What a terrible tragedy does the political history of this people, who loved to call themselves the chosen of God, present! How different would it all have been had they not rejected the Saviour! Then would he not have had to weep over the city (Luke xix. 41), foreseeing its destruction and the sorrowful destiny of the whole country (Mark xiii.); nor to say in words of lament and condemnation: "Ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate!" (Luke xiii. 34.)

At the time, however, when Jesus himself lived on the earth, the day of final ruin was not yet come. Let us look a little more closely at the aspect of affairs among those whom he called his brethren.



## III.

## THE SANHEDRIN AND THE HIGH PRIESTS.

ALTHOUGH in the days of Jesus, the political rule of Palestine was in the hands of Rome, or of the governors and procurators who represented it—and if, moreover, the Herods were at the head of the Jewish people as vassal-princes, we must still distinguish from them another authority, which to a certain extent was the highest national and indigenous court in the country—the *synedrion* in Jerusalem, the Sanhedrin or High Council. We meet with the name *synedrion* elsewhere, especially as a designation for the minor Jewish councils in particular localities ; and it is very probable that Jesus refers to such a council in his Sermon on the Mount (Matthew v. 22), and in his instructions to his disciples (Matthew x. 17, Mark xiii. 9). In the smaller places, seven men, as Josephus intimates,<sup>82</sup> seem to have formed the proper number to constitute one of these local courts. In cities with a population of at least one hundred and twenty men, the *synedrion* was formed of twenty-three persons.

But the High Council in Jerusalem was of far greater importance than these provincial centres of authority. The origin of it was traced back to Moses, who, on the march through the wilderness, nominated by Divine command seventy “elders of the people” as a council or college to assist him in the government of the tribes



(Numbers xi. 16). After the return from exile this institution, which for a long time had necessarily fallen into desuetude, was re-organized by Ezra ; but there is no trace of it after that for a long period of history. Not till about B.C. 200 do we meet with an assembly at all similar to the council of seventy. Josephus speaks of one under the name of "*gerousia*,"<sup>83</sup> that is "council of elders." In the books of Maccabees it is also so designated, or as an assembly of the "elders of the people" (I. Maccabees xii. 35, II. Maccabees i. 10, etc.) In the time of Pompey, and afterwards in that of Julius Cæsar, the name *synedrion* appears ; for example, Herod once had to defend himself before a court with this title.<sup>84</sup> In the time of Jesus it is often mentioned under the same name, and in the Acts of the Apostles it is styled "*gerousia*" and "*presbyterion*," that is the "council of the elders" (Acts v. 21, xxii. 5). The Jewish designation for it is "The Great Sanhedrin," or "The Great Court of Justice." This most important national tribunal existed under varying fortunes—sometimes freer, sometimes more repressed—as long as the Jews formed a nation. In the common ruin of the people, in the year A.D. 70, the High Council also came to an end.

It was constituted of seventy-one pure Israelite members, who in the New Testament are distinguished as chief priests (*archiereis*), elders (*presbyteroi*), and scribes (*grammateis*). The scribes were men learned in the Jewish law ; the presbyters, who were generally lay men, but some of them priests, composed the remainder of the council, that is all those who were not scribes or chief priests. It was required that they should be of

mature age, but it was not necessary that in the number of their years they should be the eldest among the people. To be a member of the Sanhedrin was a distinction as much coveted, and afforded a title of honour as highly valued, as to be one of the *gerontes* among the Greeks, or a senator at Rome ; just as similar honours are esteemed among us. The position of the Sanhedrin with respect to the religious parties among the Jews was this, that both Pharisees and Sadducees were represented in it (Acts xxiii. 6), and if the most distinguished members, the chief priests, were Sadducees (Acts v. 17), the Pharisees had the advantage of superior numbers, and as a matter of fact possessed greater influence.<sup>85</sup>

The office of president, according to the evidence of the New Testament (Matt. xxvi. 57. Acts v. 17), which is confirmed by that of Josephus,<sup>86</sup> belonged always to the High Priest, as such.<sup>87</sup> According to the Mishna, the president bore the title of "Nasi," and the vice-president that of "Ab-beth-din."

While the smaller councils held their meetings much less frequently, the sittings of the Sanhedrin took place very often, of course with the exception of the feast days, and—since sentence of condemnation was usually deferred to the following day—criminal sessions were not held on the eve of any festival. As regards the place of meeting, the 'Hall of Squares' or 'Paved Hall,' in the Temple, is often mentioned. At a later time, about A.D. 30, the high council seem to have removed to another place outside the Temple area,<sup>88</sup> but there is much uncertainty about this point. When Matthew names the palace of the High Priest Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 3 and 57) as the place

of meeting, this can only be explained by the supposition that the place of removal was in or connected with the High Priest's palace, or that the meeting there was a temporary and exceptional arrangement.

At first the Sanhedrin possessed the supreme spiritual and secular jurisdiction over the people. In the days of Jesus its functions embraced all judicial decisions and all regulations of government, which were neither left to the courts of lower rank on the one hand, nor reserved for the Roman procurators on the other.<sup>89</sup> Especially it was the duty of the Council to watch over genealogies, so as to guard the purity of the hereditary priesthood; to superintend the forms and ritual of worship; to make calculations for the calendar, to adjust the solar year with the lunar months; to fix the dates for the festivals; to decide matrimonial cases; to enforce the exact fulfilment of the law; to punish transgressors of it, and false prophets; and even to exercise judicial control over the chief priests. The right of inflicting capital punishment, or to speak more exactly, the confirmation and execution of its own death sentences, was taken from the National Council and reserved for the Roman procurator (John xviii. 31). When we read of the stoning of Stephen by the Jews (Acts vii.), this can only be regarded as an unlawful act on their part, or as an outbreak of passion and violence. The power of the Sanhedrin extended beyond the limits of Palestine. The Jewish communities in other countries, such as those in Damascus, Alexandria, and Mesopotamia submitted to its directions and decisions (Acts ix. 2).

When the Sanhedrin was assembled as a court of justice,

the accused person was examined (Matthew xxvi. 62, Mark xiv. 60); witnesses were heard (Matthew xxvi. 60, Acts vi. 13); reasons for and against conviction were adduced; and, if the accused was found guilty, sentence was passed on another day. The latter custom was not observed in the case of Jesus (Matthew xxvi. 65 and 66); he was immediately condemned for alleged blasphemy.<sup>90</sup> Peter and John were brought to the bar of the Sanhedrin as false prophets and seducers of the people (Acts iv. v.). Stephen was arraigned for "speaking blasphemous words against the holy place and the law;" and Paul was charged with teaching false doctrine (Acts xxiii.).<sup>91</sup>

Among the members of the Sanhedrin the chief priests occupied a prominent place, so that we must direct our attention a little more particularly to them. The chief priests,<sup>92</sup> who, as we have seen, appear to have been the leading personages in the Council, were in the first place the High Priests in the proper sense—that is he, or those, who were actually performing the functions of the office—and those who had formerly filled it; and in the second place those who belonged to the preferred families, from whose members the High Priests were generally taken. All the functions and virtues of the priestly office were centred in the officiating High Priest. By his office he was the mediator for the whole people before God. The conditions as to purity and holiness which were demanded of all priests were in his case raised still higher. He must be a member of a family of purely Israelitish blood, and could only take as a wife a blameless Israelitish virgin. He had his special official vestments; besides the customary priestly garment he wore a sacred robe,

called the ephod, worked in gold, purple, and crimson, in the best style of oriental workmanship; a 'breast plate' engraved with the names of the twelve tribes and set with twelve precious stones of enormous value; and the mitre, or turban, with the diadem attached, on which was inscribed:—"HOLINESS TO THE LORD" (Exodus xxviii. 36). The duties of his office were, the presidency of the Sanhedrin, the oversight of the Temple and the services held in it, the charge of the Temple treasury, and, above all, the presentation on the great Day of Atonement of the Sin-offering and the Burnt-offering (Leviticus x. 19). Besides all this he could perform every other priestly function at his pleasure.

In the time of Herod the Great, the principle of life-long tenure and hereditary succession to the office, which had been strictly adhered to, ceased entirely. Herod and the princes who succeeded him, as well as the Roman authorities, set up and deposed High Priests according to their will, and most of them remained in office but a very short time, so that from B.C. 37 to A.D. 68 as many as twenty-eight High Priests can be counted.<sup>93</sup> Annas, son of Seth (A.D. 6-15), was the ninth of these (Luke iii. 2), installed by the procurator Quirinus, and afterwards dismissed from office by Valerius Gratus. He enjoyed great respect and had much influence, even after his deposition, so that all his five sons afterwards attained the rank of High Priests. At the time when Jesus suffered, the son-in-law of Annas, Joseph Caiaphas, (from about A.D. 18-36) was actually in office, and the statement in Luke iii. 2. is not strictly exact, since Annas at the time only held the position, title, and vote of a High Priest in the Sanhedrin

(Matthew xxvi. 3, 57, John xi. 49, xviii. 13). If, according to the evangelist John, Jesus was first of all brought before Annas (John xviii. 13), this must certainly be understood of a private examination; and if Annas is often mentioned before Caiaphas (Acts iv. 6, Luke iii. 2), the reason of this is probably to be found in his powerful personality and great influence. The imperious and violent High Priest Ananias (A.D. 47-59) was the leader of the Sanhedrin when Paul had to answer for himself before it. The last who held the office was Phanas (A.D. 67-68). He was of the illustrious priestly race, and was appointed by the people themselves in the period of the Jewish wars.

For the reason that the secular power of the Romans and the Herods was superior to the office of High Priest, and dealt with it arbitrarily—and because many of its occupants showed themselves unworthy of it, degrading themselves by intrigues against one another and by greed, rapacity, and luxury—this highest position in Israel, the high priesthood, gradually sank and decayed. And thus the author of the epistle to the Hebrews could with especial emphasis contrast Jesus Christ, as the true and eternal High Priest, with the Jewish priesthood (Hebrews ii. 17, iii. 1, &c.)



## IV.

## THE SCRIBES.

AFTER the return from captivity, the written Law of Moses was more than ever held sacred as the Law of God, and piety was made to consist in the strictest conformity with its precepts. To the Pentateuch were added in time the prophetic and the rest of the sacred Books, so that a three-fold division arose, which must have been made before the time of Christ, since it is mentioned in the New Testament as already existing (Luke xxiv. 44). The first division was called the '*Law*,' that is, the whole of the five Books of Moses, or the Pentateuch. The second division was composed of the so-called '*Prophets*,' which were subdivided into the '*earlier*,' that is, the historical books, containing an account of the ministry of the older prophets; and the '*later*,' which included the first three greater and the twelve minor prophetic writings, leaving out the Book of Daniel (compare Matthew vii. 12, xi. 13, Luke xvi. 16). The third division consisted of the so-called '*Sacred Writings*' (*hagiographa*), which included the rest of the canonical Scriptures, and was sometimes called the Psalms, after its most important part (Luke xxiv. 44). This classification is mentioned in the prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus, and in the second Book of Maccabees (chap. ii. 13); and Josephus<sup>94</sup> enumerates twenty-two



Books as canonical, in which number—regard being had to the difference between the ancient Hebrew combination and arrangement of the Books and that in our Authorized Version—we find all the writings of the Old Testament now held to be Divine records. At a later time twenty-four canonical Books were reckoned, but this was only by separating certain Books which Josephus joined together.

The remaining writings, which are now left out of most of our Bibles, were of more recent date and were held in less esteem ; they were called ‘*apocryphal*,’ that is, uncanonical books, and were not read in public worship.

After the canon was settled, the conscientious study and practice of Biblical precepts, and especially the rules of the Law was held in ever increasing estimation, and extended even to the observance of particular words. As the words required exposition, and the old Hebrew language of the Scriptures had for the most part become an unknown tongue, and needed translation and explanation, an order of men was formed who were called *Scribes*, that is, men learned in the Law. Their mission was to penetrate to the sense of the Sacred Writings, and especially that of the Law, which was held to be absolutely inspired ; to interpret and apply it ; to define exactly all that was not expressly prescribed ; and thus to lay down exact and legal rules for all the circumstances and conditions of life.

In the New Testament this class of men are often referred to ; as “Scribes” (*grammateis*, Matthew ii. 4) ; as “men learned in the law” (*nomikoi*, Luke vii. 30) ; or as “teachers of the law” (*nomodidaskaloi*, Luke v. 17,

Acts v. 34). The title of honour that was accorded to them declared their importance and rank. They were generally addressed as "Rab" or "Rabbi" (Matthew xxiii. 7), which is best translated "Master" or "my Master," and reminds us of the Roman "Magister." With still higher significance they were called "Rabban" or "Rabboni," and on some occasions Jesus was thus addressed (Mark x. 51, John xx. 16).<sup>95</sup> The New Testament renders the Hebrew title often by "Lord" (*Kyrios*, Matthew viii. 25); or "Teacher" (*didaskalos*, Matthew viii. 19); or "Master" (*epistates*, Luke v. 5, viii. 24). The Scribes were also very willing to be called "Father" (*pater, abba*, Matthew xxiii. 9); and indeed they were not only eager for such honours, but they desired from their pupils and the people generally more deference than was due from a son to a father. They insisted on taking the first place everywhere, at table as well as in the schools and synagogues, and demanded to be saluted by the people in the open streets and market places (Matthew xxiii. 6, Mark xii. 38, &c.)

Their knowledge, as we have seen, was often turned to account in the Sanhedrin, and certainly also in the smaller or local councils, as men versed in the Law and in the Scriptures; and thus as juristic assistants. It was the Scribes too, principally, who as preachers in the schools and synagogues interpreted and applied the Scriptures for the edification of the religious life: and lastly they acted as teachers in the educational institutions in which youths were trained to become men learned in the Law. They had their special lecture or teaching rooms, one of which for example was in the Temple at Jerusalem (Luke ii. 46,

xx. 1, Matthew xxvi. 55, John xviii. 20) ; and here it was where Jesus, at twelve years old, by his questions and answers attracted so much attention (Luke ii. 46) ; and where he afterwards delivered many of his most powerful addresses to the people (Luke xx. 1). During the hours of instruction the pupils usually sat on the floor, and the teacher in an elevated position, so that it could be appropriately said of St. Paul that he sat at the feet of Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3). The method of instruction consisted not so much in set addresses as in questions which the teacher brought forward to be answered by the pupils, or, when necessary, by himself ; but the pupils also were allowed to put questions on their part (Luke ii. 46). Two things were especially demanded from every pupil : to faithfully preserve all that he was taught in his memory, and to transmit the doctrine exactly as he received it from the teacher. The learned labour of the Scribes was gratuitous, and the saying of Rabbi Zadok had great weight : “ Do not make the Law a crown with which to make a show of yourself, nor a hoe to till with.” Thus it was a rule that the Scribe should be acquainted with some trade or business in order, if necessary, to earn his own bread by manual labour. Rabbi Hillel therefore obtained his living as a day-labourer ; Joshua was a needle-maker ; Jochanan, a shoe-maker ;<sup>96</sup> and it is well known that the Apostle Paul, even on his arduous missionary journeys, earned his bread as a weaver of the hair-cloth of which tents were made (Acts xviii. 3 ; I. Thessalonians ii. 9 ; II. Thessalonians iii. 8). But nevertheless many of the Scribes appear to have obtained payment for their spiritual labour ; and to them the Master’s words may have applied : “ They

devour widows' houses" (Mark xii. 40). And in the life of the Scribe Hillel<sup>97</sup> we are told that as a pupil he had to pay an honorarium.

If we enquire more particularly as to the nature of their exegesis of the Scriptures, we find it consisted not so much in simple explanatory exposition as in punctiliously exact definition and settlement of the precepts of the Law, even to the minutest detail, on the one hand ; and on the other, the edifying application of the words by means of free amplification, illustration, and embellishment. Both kinds of exposition, or rather of additions to the Scriptures, were transmitted by oral tradition (Matthew xv. 2 ; Mark vii. 3) ; and they formed, as it were, a 'hedge,' which protected the letter of the Law against infringement. That part of tradition which defined and interpreted the Law, or the *Oral* Law, was called the Halacha ; and this was held to be of equal authority with the words of the Bible itself. The free practical exposition, on the other hand, which had no such binding authority, was termed the Haggada. Both the Halacha and the Haggada were, at a later period, collected and fixed in the books called the Talmud and the Midrashim. The Halacha (or Oral Law) is to be found more particularly in the Talmud, which, as is well known, consists of two parts, the Mishna and Gemara. The Mishna contains the substance of the Oral Law, or the civil and religious code of the Jews, and forms a kind of complement to the Mosaic Law. It was finally collected and fixed in its present form by Jehudah Hanassi, about the end of the second century, at Tiberias. The Gemara contains amplifications, elucidations, and closer definitions of the Mishna. It is

divided into two parts, the Palestinian Gemara, which was finished about A.D. 350, in Tiberias, and the Babylonian Gemara, which was concluded about two hundred years later, at Sura. The Haggada is principally contained in the Midrashim, especially in the later portions, which are practical and edifying commentaries upon the Biblical Books, the composition of which began about the same time as that of the Mishna. The oldest Midrash may be deemed to be the lately-discovered Ethiopic translation of the "Book of Jubilees," which originated, it is thought, in the first century. The contents of the book do not differ essentially from our canonical Genesis, on which account it is sometimes called the 'minor Genesis.' It is a "free reproduction of the Biblical primeval history from the creation of the world to the institution of the Passover, according to the conception and in the spirit of the later Judaism."<sup>98</sup>

The most celebrated names among the Scribes in the time of the Maccabees, and down to the destruction of Jerusalem, range themselves in pairs, from Jose ben Joeser and Jose ben Jochanan to Hillel and Shammai. The most important was, without doubt, Hillel,<sup>99</sup> who lived shortly before the time of Jesus. His fame rests not only upon the fact that he sought to free men from exclusive regard for mere details, and turned their attention to the Law as a whole, and also laid down certain rules, by which the unknown might be inferred from the known, analogous facts from similitudes, and things less important from the more important—but also on his personal character, his comprehension of the Scriptures, and his wise and striking proverbs for the conduct of life, which often remind us

of Jesus and his Apostles. He had immigrated from Babylonia to Palestine, and was compelled to maintain himself by hard labour ; but by talent and industry he rose to the greatest distinction among the Jewish doctors of the Law of his own and every other time. His disposition was mild and gentle, and he exhibited these qualities in his interpretation of the Law. His great contemporary, Shammai, was the very opposite of him ; his character, like his doctrine, was rugged and austere ; he represented the rigour of the Law and the duty of literal fulfilment. Thus he taught and ruled that the smallest child, even the baby at the breast, should be made to fast on the great Day of Atonement. Tradition says, that in those days, and as long as the strife between the two schools of Shammai and Hillel lasted, it was as if the Law were divided into two irreconcilable doctrines. Nevertheless, the teachers themselves seem to have been much more peaceable with one another than might have been expected from the antagonism of their schools. In time, the less severe views of Hillel prevailed more and more in practice ; but still there were people here and there who agreed with the teaching of Shammai. Of the later Rabbis who were heads of schools, the grandson of Hillel, the elder Gamaliel, was one of the most famous. He was a contemporary of Jesus, and died about eighteen years after the destruction of Jerusalem. He was held in such great respect that he was the first to receive the highest title of honour, Rabban, and it was said that after his death the glory of the Law had departed. The supposition that he was president of the Sanhedrin is contradicted by the fact, that in his time that office was held by the High



Priest for the time being. To Christians he is known as the teacher of the Apostle Paul (Acts xxii. 3), and by his judgment respecting Christianity when Peter and other Apostles stood before the High Council: "If this work be of men, it will come to nought; if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it" (Acts v. 38, 39). Christian tradition, on account of this saying of his, has, without due warrant, represented him as favourable to Christianity, and, indeed, as having been baptized by Peter and John.

In comparison with these great men the other Scribes are thrown into the shade. But the theoretical and practical interpretation of the Scriptures, especially of the Law, was the common task of all of them; and excellent and honourable was the object that they earnestly sought to attain in their theological and juristic colleges, or in their homiletic addresses in the synagogues—the preservation of the Mosaic religion in its purity, and the regulation and maintenance of the life of the people in accordance with the Law. But on the other hand it must be said against them that, in the time of Jesus especially, the method by which they sought to accomplish their purpose was false and corrupt. Instead of apprehending the word of the Scriptures in spirit and in truth, the constant endeavour was to enforce all that pertained to the Law outwardly, and according to the literal sense, or the mere sound of the words. The Law was expounded; that is, the great point was how the simple Law could be made applicable to all imaginable circumstances of the manifold life of man; and the result was a subtilty, a slavery to the letter, and a casuistry, which often verges on absurdity and imbecility.



No doubt Jesus refers ironically to this where he asks (Matthew xii. 11) what was to be done if a sheep fell into a pit on the Sabbath day, since he well knew that one party thought that a man should let him remain there until the Sabbath was past, and the other that he ought straightway to pull him out. Such questions were seriously considered, as whether any assistance should be given to a cow if she was calving on the Sabbath, and if on that day a man ought to bring water to an animal, or the animal to the water. The sanctification of the Sabbath was carried out in the most rigorous and punctilious way (Matthew xii. 12); no battle must be fought on that day (I. Maccabees ii. 34-38); the utmost that was permitted was to fight in self-defence (I. Maccabees ii. 40); no journey must be made to a greater distance than two thousand cubits, or six-tenths of a mile, the so-called Sabbath day's journey; and all labour must cease. There were thirty-nine particular works which the Rabbis strictly prohibited on the Sabbath; such as to sow, to plough, to tie or untie a knot, to sew two stitches, to kindle or extinguish a fire, to bear fire from one place to another, and so forth. And each of these prohibitions was made the subject of special interpretation and exact definition. Not only so, but such actions as might by possibility lead to a transgression of the law of the Sabbath were forbidden. Thus the writer must not go out with his pen, nor the tailor with his needle, in the evening before the Sabbath day, since he might forget it and bear it about with him after sunset and thus when the Sabbath had begun. The most that was allowed on the Sabbath was circumcision (John vii. 22), assistance to women in labour,

and help to anyone in danger of losing his life. And yet we learn from the life of Jesus, that the over-zealous Jews regarded his healing of diseases on the Sabbath as a profanation (Matthew xii. 10, Mark iii. 1-6, &c.) Although it was allowable to pluck the ears of corn from the field to satisfy hunger, it was held to be strictly unlawful on the Sabbath (Luke vi. 2). In order the more surely to avoid the misuse of the name of God, the utterance of it—*Jehovah* or *Jahveh*—was absolutely forbidden; and where it occurred in the Hebrew Scriptures, "*Adonai*" was read instead of it, (in the Septuagint, "*Kyrios*," that is, Lord.) The obligation to pay tithe was extended even to herbs, such as mint, anise, &c., in order that the law on the subject might be most punctiliously fulfilled (Matthew xxiii. 23.) When Jesus said, "Ye strain at a gnat and swallow a camel," he referred to the habit of the strict Jews of filtering their wine, in order not to swallow any little insect that might have been drowned in it. In the same passage our Lord condemns the Scribes for their exaggerated purifications (Matthew xxiii. 25). Here the questions were, what vessels were clean or unclean, and what water was proper for the various kinds of purification, for sprinkling the hands, for the immersion of utensils, and for baths. And in respect to the washing of hands the question was thoroughly discussed—what vessel it must be done in, who should pour in or pour out the water, in what manner a man should immerse the hands, whether he should hold them with the palms upwards or downwards, wash them as far as the knuckles, or only the tips of the fingers. Scrupulous attention was given to the three mementoes, by which every Israelite ought con-

tinually to remind himself of his religious duties ; the tassels or fringes on the four corners of his mantle (the "*zizith*," Deuteronomy xxii. 12, Matthew xxiii. 5) ; the so-called '*mesusa*,' a small case or box which was fixed to the door posts, and contained a roll of parchment on which were inscribed, in twenty two lines, passages from Deuteronomy (chap. vi. 4-9, and xi. 13-21) ; and the 'phylacteries' (Hebrew, '*tephillin*'), that is, strips of parchment on which certain texts of Scripture (Exodus xiii. 1-10, 11-16, Deuteronomy vi. 4-9, xi. 18-21) were inscribed, and enclosed in a small leather case, which was fastened with straps on the forehead and on the left arm, near the heart, to denote the keeping of the Law with head and heart (Matthew xxiii. 5). Here it was held to be of the greatest consequence to determine exactly how many threads the tassels or fringes must consist of, how the paragraphs of the *mesusa* were to be written, and what should be the proper length of the straps of the *tephillin*.

Prayer was confined to outward forms, so that it was hardly spoken of as the free communion of the heart with God. The Jewish confession of faith (called the '*shema*,' Deut. vi. 4-9 and xi. 13-21, Numbers xv. 37-41), and the appended thanksgivings were the principal prayer of the Jews. Strict rules were laid down as to how often and at what hours it was to be said. The times held to be right and most pleasing to God were the third hour (Acts ii. 15), the sixth (Acts x. 9), and the ninth (Acts iii. 1 and x. 30). The question was debated whether, and under what circumstances, a man might greet another during the repetition of the '*shema*.' The most zealous, if the right moment had come, prayed in the midst of the streets, or

at the corners ; but unfortunately this was often only done to be seen and praised of men (Matthew vi. 5). And if it was a beautiful custom to give thanks to God at meals, this, too, was regulated down to the minutest detail, and proper forms were settled for use when partaking of wine or fruit, of bread or vegetables. Great diligence was demanded in prayer ; but if the Jews often only prayed externally, and for the sake of fulfilling the Law—and if the saying of Isaiah applied to them : “This people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear of me is taught by the precept of men” (Isaiah xxix. 13 ; Matthew xv. 7)—had they not their full reward in the mere praise of men ? In the same way fasting was made a bare external performance in those days. The Scribes and Pharisees attached great importance to it (Matthew ix. 14 ; Luke v. 33). The proper days for it were held to be the second and fifth in the week, because on the one Moses ascended into the mountain, and on the other descended from it. Besides these there were extraordinary fast days, as for example, when the commencement of the rainy season was delayed. Indeed many observed additional fasts of their own free will, and some fasted the whole year through on the days named, like the Pharisee, who boasted : “I fast twice in the week” (Luke xviii. 12). How fondly they thought by such bodily chastisement, to make merit before God, and to induce Him to pour out His blessing upon them ! Jesus did not take upon himself the yoke of this external, regular and periodical fasting (Matthew ix. 14 and xi. 19) ; but he recognized the religious importance of fasting when it is

true and real, that is, when it is the expression of genuine inward humility before God, in contrition of heart and earnest seeking of His face. In the sermon on the mount he speaks of such fasting along with prayer as a voluntary and secret act of the soul before God alone (Matthew vi. 16) ; and in another place he plainly implies that there are seasons when abstinence from food may not only be a natural act, but also a means of grace (Matthew ix. 15). At the same time he spoke earnestly against fasting when it was a mere external work, and the expression of a hypocritical and sanctimonious spirit.

It is certain however that there were Scribes who strove with all their heart after the true fulfilment of the Law, and in many a deep and true saying which has come down to us they insist on inward religiousness. For example, Antigonus of Socho says that we ought to be like those servants who render service regardless of reward ; and Rabbi Juda urges us to be “courageous as a leopard and alert as an eagle, swift as a hart and strong as a lion, to do the will of our Father in heaven !” But on the whole it was mere sanctimonious outward works that the Scribes commanded, and they laid heavy unbearable burdens on men’s shoulders (Matthew xxiii. 4 ; Luke xi. 46). The mere outward form of the Law was esteemed above all things ; its inward spirit and vitality were neglected ; the outward keeping of fast and festival days, the paying of tithes, and the various ceremonial purifications had become the main things. The root of the matter, that is, a religious and moral heart and life, was slighted (Matthew xxiii. 25). It was, however, just this bondage to the letter, and this mechanical outward right-

eousness, which demanded a thorough renewal of the true worship of Jehovah, and a new conception of religion in spirit and in truth (John iv. 23, 24).

The true and complete understanding of the Law was first disclosed by Jesus. who "taught as one having authority, and not as the Scribes" (Matthew vii. 29). He stated clearly the real scope and design of the Old Testament, the sanctification of man and the restoration of fellowship with God; he set fully in the light the eternal meaning and value of the Law; and while liberating men from the yoke of mere outward forms and rules, he demanded at the same time the true fulfilment of the Law in willing obedience towards God proceeding from faith and love. Of course for this he had to bear the enmity of the teachers of the Law; they watched to see whether he would do anything against its precepts (Luke vi. 7 and xi. 54); they murmured condemnation of his sayings, habits, and practices, (Matthew ix. 3, Luke v. 30 and xv. 2), and sought to entrap him by cunningly devised questions (Matthew xxii. 35, Luke x. 25); and if at first they could prevail nothing against him, the animosity of their hearts increased, which at last doomed him to death (Luke xx. 19 and xix. 48).



## V.

## RELIGIOUS LIFE AMONG THE JEWS.

WHAT has been said in the preceding chapter will have shown that the most powerful interest felt among the higher rank of Jews, in the Sanhedrin and by the Scribes, was in the traditional Mosaic religion and the Law. If we take a wider outlook we shall ascertain how the consciousness of the whole people also turned upon their religion and their Law. The local centre of the entire religious life of the people was the Temple in Jerusalem. The centres of union for individual congregations were the synagogues or schools. Almost the only merit of Herod the Great in the eyes of the Jews was that long after the temple of Solomon had been destroyed, and when the second Temple, built after the return from captivity under Zerubbabel, appeared to him to be insufficient and wanting in grandeur, he rebuilt it on a larger scale and with royal splendour, beginning the great work about twenty years before the Christian era. It stood on the east side of Jerusalem,<sup>100</sup> and was surrounded on the south, west, and north, by parts of the city. On the east and north the hill on which the Temple was built, was inaccessible; on the west a gate opening to the 'bridge of Christ,' which spanned the valley of the Tyropæon, connected it with Mount Zion; besides which two gates to the north of the bridge led down into the City across

the separating valley. To the south of the bridge was another gate with a flight of steps leading down into the Tyropœon, where the depression in the ground was greater, and from thence, according to Josephus, up into the City. The entire Temple-area was enclosed with a quadrangular wall, each side being a furlong, or about 200 yards, in length, through which several gates afforded entrance and exit. From hence the several buildings of the Temple rose in the form of terraces, one court being placed within and higher than another, and the House itself, or the Temple properly so called, on the highest level of all, and on its northern side; so that when the white marble of which it was built and the gold with which it was adorned glittered in the sun-light, it could be seen not only in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, but from a long way off. In going up to the Temple the first part reached was the Outer Place, or "Court of the Lord's House" (Ezekiel xl. 17; Jeremiah xix. 14, xxvi. 2), called by later writers the "Court of the Gentiles," because non-Israelites were permitted to enter it, their further advance being forbidden on pain of death by Greek and Latin inscriptions affixed to the columns. It was paved with stone of various colours, and surrounded by a covered arcade or colonnade, roofed with cedar, resting on massive white marble columns of the Corinthian order. From this outer court a flight of nineteen steps led to the next terrace or platform, the more sacred limits of which were fenced off by a low balustrade of stone. Here was the second court or "Court of the Women," separated from that of the men by a wall, beyond which the women were not allowed to proceed; and here

it is thought was the "Beautiful Gate" of the Temple (Acts iii. 2). From this second court another flight of fifteen steps led to the "Court of the Israelites." A stone balustrade separated this from the 'Court of the Priests,' which surrounded the Temple properly so called, and in which the great Altar of Burnt-offering stood. The Temple proper, or as it is sometimes called, the Inner Temple, was a rectangular edifice of about forty yards long by twenty-five broad, but having wings at the front, which made the facade of the vestibule equal in breadth to the length of the main building. Another flight of steps led from the court of the priests to the vestibule, the front of which was adorned with a golden vine of colossal size, an emblem of the Promised Land. An entrance with gilded folding doors, and hung besides with a richly embroidered curtain or veil of tapestry work, led to the Holy Place, in which were the Table of Shew-bread, the Seven-branched Candlestick, and the Altar of Incense. The 'Holiest of All,' which was quite empty, was divided from the Holy Place by another curtain; and this was the 'veil of the Temple' which, when Jesus died, was "rent in twain from the top to the bottom" (Matthew xxvii. 51).

This Temple formed the religious centre of the nation, and the whole people looked up to it with holy reverence as the visible dwelling-place of the invisible God. The ground on which it stood was, to the Jew, holy ground, and the greatest horror that he could imagine was the "abomination of desolation" set up in the Holy Place—the desecration of the majestic Temple. Every man among the people was determined to defend it to the last, and hence the extraordinary and desperate efforts

that the Jews made when the city was besieged by the Romans, at least to save their Holy Place.

To make a pilgrimage to the Temple, and there to pray and offer sacrifice, was to every worshipper of Jehovah the most glorious and soul-quickenning privilege of all his life. Not only at the seasons of the great festivals, but also at other times, there was a crowd of Jews from all Palestine and from foreign parts, often numbering hundreds of thousands, in Jerusalem. Hither the inhabitants of the provinces carried their first-fruits; hither the Israelites of Palestine and those dispersed about the world brought their due contributions or their free-will offerings for the Temple; and here in the outer Court of the Temple was the place where all countries and all languages were represented, where the Herodians were accustomed to address the people, and where Jesus also delivered some of his most exalted discourses.

For the convenience of worshippers at the feasts, and to enable them easily to procure the proper animals, etc., for the sacrifices, a regular Temple market was held in the Outer Court, or "Court of the Gentiles." Oxen, sheep, and doves were kept for sale, and the money-changers offered the proper currency in exchange for pagan Roman, or Greek money, which was unlawful in the Temple (John ii. 14, Matthew xxi. 12). In other parts of the Temple there were rooms in which worshippers could perform their devotions and vows; in the Paved Hall, or "Hall of Squares," the Sanhedrin assembled; in other chambers, or halls, the Scribes taught and disputed (Luke ii. 46).

The persons who had charge of the Temple, a great

company of whom were always in residence, were the priests, whose duty it was to mediate between the people and God. The descendants of Aaron were designated for the principal services of the Holy Place ; next to them stood the rest of the tribe of Levi, who were selected for secondary duties, such as the watching and care of the Temple, the performance of the music, the collection of dues, and rendering assistance in various ways at the sacrifices ; for the lowest duties there were special servants. The religious importance and dignity of the priestly order had certainly declined in the time of Jesus, and they were much more conscious of being a privileged class, as if they were the nobility of the nation, than of being the mediators between God and the people ; but notwithstanding the priesthood continued to be an indispensable institution of religion, and they were not without a decided influence over the multitude. All the priests did not dwell in the Temple itself ; many resided in other parts of the city ; others in the provinces, in the ‘cities of the Levites,’ as they were called ; or in places not far from the capital. Zacharias, for example, the father of John the Baptist, had his home in the city of Juda, in the “hill country” (Luke i. 39).

The head of the priesthood was the High Priest,<sup>101</sup> who was assisted in all religious affairs by a council of priests ; but immediately under his control was the ‘captain,’ or ruler, ‘of the Temple’ and a great number of lower officials. Among the latter there was one whose duty it was to keep the times for service ; another for the opening and closing of the doors ; one who was over the Temple watch, another who was over the singers ; and various

others again who superintended the sacrifices, incensing, etc. The many official duties were distributed among the priests by lot, such as the kindling of the censers containing the incense, the maintenance of the fire upon the Altar of Burnt-offering, the examination of persons who were ceremonially unclean, more especially lepers (Matthew viii. 4, Luke xvii. 14). A priestly choir of singers and instrumentalists provided for the musical part of Divine Service and announced the particular times of prayer and sacrifice by the sound of the trumpet. The whole priesthood was, as we have seen in a former chapter, divided into twenty-four classes, of which that of Zacharias—the “course of Abia”—was the eighth (Luke i. 5; I. Chronicles vii. 8 and xxv. 10). The priests derived their temporal support from certain allowances of the meat presented in sacrifice, from offerings of first-fruits and from tithes.

In order to form an approximate picture of the priestly service in the Temple, let us glance at the Holy Place on a week-day. After midnight the Captain of the Temple together with a number of priests arose from their beds and with torches in their hands went through the Temple, examining the particular courts and their chambers, in order to see if everything was in a state of preparation for the worship at the dawn of day. When they came upon a watch, the latter called out: “Captain, peace be with thee!” If everything was in order the priests replied: “All is well!” Soon the rest of the priests rose from their couches, bathed themselves, and put on their official vestments. Then they proceeded to distribute by lot the different priestly functions for the day.



After that the first morning peal was blown from the trumpets, to announce to the city lying below the near approach of day. Then the doors were opened, and the wood, which in the meantime had been laid on the altar of burnt offering, was kindled. As soon as the watchers upon the Temple ramparts could perceive in the morning light the city of Hebron, lying on the south-east of Jerusalem, the signal was given : "The light shines from Hebron !" and the sacrificial victim for the morning fell under the hand of the priest ; the blood was sprinkled on the Altar, and the parts which were proper for sacrifice were carried to the Altar of Burnt-offering.

Immediately after the immolation came a service of prayer with music and song. This was followed by the burning of incense upon the golden Altar, at which the priestly blessing was pronounced. The sacrificing priest then performed his functions at the Altar of Burnt-offering, while the Levites sang psalms, accompanied by the sound of trumpets.<sup>102</sup> About mid-day the priests and Levites, except on fast days, dined. Two hours and a half from mid-day the evening worship began with the slaughter of the sacrificial lamb, with which was joined the presentation of any other sacrificial offerings. Immediately after sunset the evening service of prayer was closed ; after that, the vessels were purified and made ready for the following day ; and then there was nothing to do but to await the arrival of the priests who would come to relieve those in charge, and to enter on the services of the new day.

On the Sabbaths and great feast days the services were similar, but were celebrated with more pomp and cere-

mony, especially by the addition of longer chants, as the song of Moses (Deuteronomy xxxii.) and the song of victory (Exodus xv.). The most arduous, and at the same time the most impressive service in the Temple was that held on the great Day of Atonement. It was mainly performed by the High Priest alone, who had to undergo a seven days' preparation for it. In the night before the great day, he was occupied in reading or being read to, since for twenty-four hours he must not close his eyes in sleep. On the day itself, after ceremonial bathings and washings, the golden vestments were put on; then followed the morning sacrifice, the burning of incense, and worship with prayer, singing, and benediction. Now came repeated sacred washings, the putting on of white garments by the High Priest, and the observance of many various ceremonies. Next took place the casting of lots upon the two goats, to decide which should be a sin-offering unto the Lord, and which the scape-goat (Leviticus xvi.). A young bullock was also slain as a sin-offering, and solemn confession of sin made. The High Priest entered the Holy of Holies to burn incense, and again, later, to sprinkle first the blood of the young bullock and afterwards that of the goat dedicated to God. Many particular observances, regulated to the minutest detail, concluded the solemnities. It is impossible to describe them all here, but the climax of all was the confession of sin, the entering of the Holy Place and the sprinkling of blood by the High Priest.

In the unhappy time of the exile, the sacrificial services in the Temple were of course at an end, and hence it may well be that we must seek in this epoch of Israeli-

tish history for the origin of an institution of religion among the Jews which at the return of the people in Ezra's time must have been transplanted into Palestine—as we may infer from Nehemiah viii. 1 to 8—and which at the time of Jesus was everywhere at the height of its prosperity: the institution of the Synagogue, or school of religion. No sacrifices might be offered in the meeting-places of the schools, as they were only lawful in the Temple; but prayers were offered, and the Scriptures were read and practically expounded. The principal object, however, aimed at in the Synagogue was the instruction of the adult members of the congregation in Biblical history and doctrine, especially in the Law, accompanied by prayer (Matthew iv. 23; Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 15; John vi. 59.) At Jerusalem such Jewish schools were found in great numbers; as many as four hundred and eighty are spoken of; so that even the Jews, who came up to the feasts from the dispersion in foreign countries, such as the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians and others (Acts vi. 9), had their own synagogues in Jerusalem. In other great cities there were also several synagogues (Acts ix. 20), and they were met with even in places with a smaller number of inhabitants; thus Jesus could interpret the Scriptures in the school at Nazareth, the home of his childhood (Matthew xiii 54; Luke iv. 16), or take the post of the teacher in his favourite city of Capernaum (Mark i. 21) and elsewhere. And, like himself, his Apostles at a later period were accustomed, wherever they came, first of all to visit the Synagogue (Acts xiv. 1; xvii. 2, xviii. 4, etc.). Beside such schools which were built in the midst of cities, there were

places for prayer open to the sky, which, on account of the ablutions which were necessary before prayer, were often built by the river side or near water, as at Philippi (Acts xvi. 13).

The erection and maintenance of the Synagogue buildings was the business of the congregations; but nevertheless they were sometimes built by private individuals and we know that the elders of the Jews in Capernaum extolled the heathen centurion because he had "built them a Synagogue" (Luke vii. 5). If we take a look for a moment into the audience chamber of a Synagogue, we see therein the 'chief seats' (Matthew xxiii. 6; compare James ii. 3 and Luke iv. 16); a desk for the reader, probably a little elevated; a chest or shrine, in which were preserved the rolls of the Holy Books, and perhaps some lamps for use at evening worship. Over every such building was a 'ruler' (Mark v. 35, Luke viii. 49), or principal, whose duty it was to attend to the external affairs of the Synagogue, and the maintenance of order in the meetings (Luke xiii. 14; Acts xiii. 15). Associated with him in the management were a number of men who were called 'elders' (Luke vii. 3; Mark v. 22; Acts xiii. 15). The servants ('ministers,' Luke iv. 20) performed such duties as the opening and closing of the doors of the Synagogue, keeping the building clean and in order, handing to the reader for the day the roll of the Scriptures, and receiving it from him.

When the congregation, which was divided into sections according to age and sex, had assembled, the service began with prayer; first of all the confession of faith, the *shema*, as it was called: "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our

God is one Lord!" &c. (Deuteronomy vi. 4, &c., to which was added Deuteronomy xi. 13-21 and Numbers xv. 37-41); then followed the proper prayer, the *tephilla*, divided into eighteen parts. The entire congregation stood up (Matthew vi. 5; Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11) with their faces towards the Temple in Jerusalem (Daniel vi. 10; II. Chronicles vi. 34); the reader of the prayer lifted up his voice, and all those who were present responded with the Amen. Next in order was reading the proper portion of the Law, which for the purposes of worship was divided into a hundred and fifty-four passages or lessons which were read in order according to a fixed cycle. This office was not performed by a reader permanently appointed, but any fit person in the congregation could take part in the duty. When one or another was called forward by the ruler or an elder, he accepted the invitation and read aloud the passage indicated to him. To the weekly Lesson from the Law was added in the time of Jesus—at least in the Sabbath services (Acts xiii. 27)—a stated portion from the prophets, the *Haphtarah*, as it was called, or second Lesson.<sup>103</sup> As the ancient Hebrew of the Scriptures had become unintelligible to many, an interpreter now translated the Lessons verse by verse into the Aramaic dialect of the country, after which what had been read was expounded and discussed by the people, all sitting (Luke iv. 20). But although any one was now at liberty to speak, all were not able to do so, and hence it was that a Scribe or any other suitable person had an opportunity in the Synagogues of turning his knowledge to advantage. It is well known that in the Synagogue at Nazareth the

Book of the Prophet Isaiah was handed to Jesus, and that after he had read a passage from chapter lxi., he rolled up the sacred manuscript, gave it back to the 'minister' or servant, and then sat down and began to discourse about it. The Apostles Paul and Barnabas availed themselves of similar opportunities to speak in the Synagogue (Acts xiii. 14). The service was closed by the benediction, generally pronounced by a priest, and which the people made their own by responding Amen.

Such services in the Synagogue, which afterwards served as a model for Christian congregations (James ii. 2), took place now and then on a week-day, especially on market days ; but the Sabbath was pre-eminently the day for religious assemblies and worship, as it was also the great day of the religious life. When festivals took place, however, the people observed them in the Synagogues as well as in the Temple and in their houses, whether they meditated on the gracious leadings of God and gave Him thanks—as at the Feast of Tabernacles, the Pentecost, and the Passover—or recalled sorrowful events ; or in the consciousness of their own guilt humbled themselves before God and repented in sackcloth and ashes.

From the Temple the light of religion shone forth, so to speak, over the whole people of the Jews, and from the Synagogues over particular communities ; but the great purpose which it was sought to fulfil in both Temple and Synagogue was that everyone should know and feel himself one of the people of God ; that everyone should seek in religion his joy and comfort and hope ; and that everyone should connect all the activities, circumstances, and events of life with the service of God. That the religious life thus



nurtured did not diminish was largely owing to another influence which the Jews were careful to maintain: the education of the young in the knowledge and practice of the Law. Josephus says: "We devote the greatest pains to the education of children, and make the observance of the Law and the rules of piety which have been given us the most important business of our lives."<sup>104</sup> Philo also reminds us that the Jews were well instructed in the Law from their earliest youth upward.<sup>105</sup> And Paul could write to his pupil Timothy, as one who had "known the Holy Scriptures from a child" (II. Timothy iii. 15). By what means was this great object of education attained? Temple and Synagogue both made their important influence felt by the young; but the daily use of verses from the Sacred Writings, the manifold symbolical actions which were always taking place in family life, and the whole atmosphere in which the people lived, educated the child unconsciously in the religious views of his race. And, above all, every father regarded it as his most important duty to make his child, whether son or daughter, familiar from infancy with the history of the Jewish people and with their Law; to explain all existing customs and usages; and to awaken and nourish an interest and love for the religion of the father-land. As soon as he was twelve years old, the Jewish boy especially was held to a stricter observance of the Law, and participation in worship, since he was now a "son of the Law;" and diligent attendance at the Temple in Jerusalem and at the Synagogues was impressed upon him as a duty and a privilege. The history of Jesus shows that this custom was observed in his case (Luke ii. 41-43).

If, however, the earliest instruction was that which was thus given in the family, there were not wanting also, even at the time of Jesus, public schools, whose object it was likewise to spread and increase religious knowledge. Jerusalem was, to some extent, an academical city for the education of Scribes ; and Paul, the pupil of Gamaliel, belonged once to a school there, in which Jewish divinity was studied (Acts xxii. 3). Under Alexandra (see page 70) it would seem that schools for the instruction of children in the knowledge of the Law were introduced in other great cities. And as we are told that as early as about A.D. 6 Jesus ben Gamaliel had established schools for boys in every country and every city,<sup>106</sup> it may be that public schools, although not regularly organized, existed here and there in the days of Jesus. The Law was always the subject of the lessons given, and it was a high object of ambition with any child to be able to read the Sacred Writings, and a higher still to be able to write the language of the original. The first school in which Jesus was trained was undoubtedly the home of his parents (Luke ii. 40). There he may have obtained his first knowledge of Jewish history and Biblical lore, and possibly acquired his facility in quoting from the Hebrew Scriptures. And that which was begun in the home was developed afterwards by the Synagogue at Nazareth, while the visits to the great feasts at Jerusalem would still further enlarge his knowledge. Above all, he must have taken good heed for himself not merely to the Sacred Writings, but to the books of Nature and the world of men which lay open before him ; so that he made evident intellectual and religious progress, and it could be said of

him : "The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom : and the grace of God was upon him" (Luke ii. 40 and 52). Of any regular attendance at a school, on the other hand, we have no trace whatever. With reading he was certainly well acquainted, and more than probably, also with writing (Luke iv. 16). How often he rebuked the Pharisees with the words : "Have ye not read?" (Matthew xii. 3, 5, xix. 4, xxii. 31). How accurately he knew the Text ! How closely he describes the letter down to the minutest detail ! (Matthew v. 18 ; Luke xvi. 17) And although we possess nothing written by him, may not John viii. 6 be taken as a proof of his readiness in writing : "Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground?"

If we review now all the arrangements and customs which have been cited, we must acknowledge that all the influences to which a Jew was subject from childhood helped to awaken and sustain in him religious sensibilities—that all impelled the individual soul to place himself and his life at the service of the Lord. His whole life was permeated with religion ; all his memories, his hopes and wishes, his joy and trust, he was accustomed to refer to God. The customs and usages of religion accompanied him everywhere, day by day, week in and week out ; and religious duties were never absent from a single hour of his life. The daily prayers, the preparations for the festivals, the religious assemblies in the Synagogue, the going up to the Temple, the paying of tithes and dues, the sacrifices and vows, the constant attention paid to the fulfilment of all precepts, to purity and impurity, to usages of a joyful or a sad nature—all this, the whole of

which was obligatory, enables us to easily understand how the Jew felt himself continually face to face with religion, and recognized in it his element and his life.

But at the same time we must not shut our eyes to the fact, which has been already pointed out, that the religious life had become with the mass of the people a mere external matter, and that only a few souls penetrated from the shell to the kernel, from the letter to the spirit. The influence of the priesthood, and especially of the Scribes, like that of the Pharisees, was exaggerated and excessive ; their views, teachings, and requirements permeated every stratum of society. The pilgrimages to the Temple, the sacrifices and tithes, were the most available merits ; but how seldom was the outward act the expression of an inward grateful disposition towards God ! Prayers were said diligently at the appointed times ; but was it not often nothing better than a mere babble of the lips ? The law of the Sabbath and of the feasts, as expounded by the Rabbis, was strictly kept ; was it not often only a mechanical obedience, without any deep devotion of the mind ? And with all the observance of precepts [and rules about fasts and purifications, was not the essence of religion, the constant surrender of the heart to God, with many entirely missing ? The fruits of the labours of the Rabbis were everywhere seen among the people in superficial formality, and a slavish dependence on works and the letter, without the "Spirit of Truth." The more earnest and deeply-interested among the people were forced to confess that there was no satisfaction for the soul, no blessed peace for the heart, to be found in mere religious performances. And thus it was just among the best

of the people that there was a longing desire and expectation of Him of whom their fathers had prophesied centuries before as the Prince of peace, and the Redeemer of souls, and who was already in the midst of them (John i. 26 ; Matthew iii. 11).

---

## VI.

### THE RELIGIOUS PARTIES AMONG THE JEWS.

It may be easily understood that among a people such as the Jews, entirely possessed by great special ideas, particular forms of life would everywhere manifest themselves ; and under the influence of foreigners, especially that of the Pagan yoke of Rome, the inward opposition, more particularly among the better sort, must have been constantly renewed, and evermore openly signified. Hence the newly-awakened theocratic consciousness among the Jews in the time of Jesus ; hence the diligent heed which was given to the expositions of the Law in the Temple and in the Synagogues ; and hence also the painstaking observance of the numberless definitions and details of the Law, and the constant resort to Jerusalem at the great feasts by people from near and far. It is estimated, as we have said in a former chapter, that at times as many as three million guests were present, and that two hundred and fifty thousand animals were slain in sacrifice. The treasury of the Temple possessed £600,000, and reckoning in addition the value of the gold and silver and the sacred

utensils which it held besides money, its entire wealth must have been little short of two and a half millions. But the active specific life which was stirring among the Jews showed itself especially in the formation of different parties. These were not sects, as they are sometimes erroneously called, since they all stood upon the basis of the Jewish Law, and their different opinions were only with regard to the proper position to be taken in respect of it, and the true conception and practice of it. In considering this matter, we must direct our attention especially to the three principal parties, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes ; but at the same time not overlooking some other schools of religious thought.

The two first-named parties were by far the most prominent in the days of Jesus, and hence it is that they are so frequently mentioned in the New Testament. The Pharisees were much the most numerous and the more powerful in their influence over the people. Their name signifies "the separated," that is, the people who by their superior holiness distinguished themselves from the sinful multitude, and especially from the Gentiles (Luke xviii. 11). The tendency of thought to which they probably owed their origin manifested itself after the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth, perhaps as early as the time of Ezra. In the time of the Maccabees we meet with the *Chasidim* (II. Maccabees xiv. 6), or the Assideans as they are called in our version, meaning 'the religious,' 'the patriots.' The *Chasidim* were probably the progenitors of the Pharisees, since the mission of the latter, like that of the former, was on its negative side a struggle against heathenism, and in its positive aspect, the strictest possi-



ble conformity with the Jewish Law. In the days of the High Priest Jonathan, the party was specified under the name of Pharisees, as were also the Sadducees under their name; and it may be that then they first attained special political and religious importance.<sup>107</sup> At the time of Jesus the party, which included many Scribes and members of the Sanhedrin, numbered more than six thousand members, and formed a fellowship without any rigid outward organization.<sup>108</sup> Their great distinction was that they zealously sought to bring the people back to the strictest observance of the Law of Moses and the rules of their fathers. Pharisaism was an energetic reaction against the apostasy from the native laws and customs: its constant endeavour was to determine exactly what was forbidden and what was permitted by the Law, and to scrupulously fulfil whatever was commanded. Hence they were held by the people to be the most careful expositors and doers of the Law; and prided themselves on being its champions, and on belonging to a party whose ideal object was that every Israelite should know the Law and take its yoke upon him; and, indeed, that the whole people should attain to "the heritage, the kingdom, the priesthood, and the sanctuary" (II. Maccabees ii. 17). But their exposition and practice of the Law was certainly punctilious and, in some respects, petty and paltry. The essential thought and spiritual meaning of Moses and the Prophets: "Love God and thy neighbour!" they do not seem to have apprehended (Deuteronomy vi. 5, Leviticus xix. 18, Mark xii. 30). They attributed the greatest importance not to the moral sentiment and disposition, but to the

outward act. The weightier matters of the Law, the inward spiritual life—righteousness, charity, and faithfulness—were neglected, and in their place were substituted such comparative trivialities as the tithing of mint, anise, and other herbs (Matthew xxiii. 23). Not to purity of heart, but to the washing of hands and the cleansing of pots and cups, was the chief attention given (Matthew xv. 14-20, Mark vii. 8). Their great delight was to give themselves airs of sanctity and reverence by much almsgiving, the exhibition of devotion in the Synagogues or on the streets, and by frequent fasts (Luke xviii.). No doubt at the beginning of their history they cherished a genuine religiousness and a deep inward and outward morality, but in the time of which we are speaking, all this was wanting with most of them (Matthew v. 20, xxiii. 3); and in place of it was a lax morality, under a fine disguise of piety, and even the worst wickedness (Matthew xxiii. 27, John viii. 7); indeed, hypocrisy and mock sanctity were their special characteristics. Of course there were still amongst them many honest, high-minded, and upright men, who united inward piety with external religiousness, such as a Nicodemus, a Joseph of Arimathea, or a Gamaliel (John iii., Acts v. 34). But the principles of the Pharisees, the literal apprehension and fulfilment of the Law, even to the pettiest crotchet, led all too easily to superficial formality. If literal fulfilment was to be carried out, however, every particular precept must be defined as closely as possible; and it was the boast of the Scribes and Pharisees that they had erected a 'fence' round the Law by a multitude of traditions, and that they scrupulously obeyed a vast

number of precepts which formed the Oral Law. They not only ascribed to these "traditions of the elders" legal authority, but even exalted them above the commands of Moses (Matthew xxiii. 2, Mark vii. 3, Matthew xv. 2); and thus the Mishna says: "It is more culpable to teach anything against the regulations of the Scribes than against the Scripture itself."

It was just at this point, that is as respects the authority of tradition or the Oral Law, that the Pharisees were most opposed to the Sadducees, who rejected it and also the Pharisaic doctrines of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body (Matthew xxii. 23, Mark xii. 18, Luke xx. 27, Acts xxiii. 8).<sup>109</sup> The Pharisees also believed in the existence of angels and higher spirits, while the Sadducees denied it. And, finally, the former affirmed the definite influence of fate, of heaven-appointed destiny, upon the freedom of man. "Everything," says Rabbi Akiba, "is foreseen by God, but freedom is given" (to man). The destiny of everyone is determined by God, but within the limits of it man is a free agent, and his virtue is his merit. In his works, whether they are good or evil, man does not act alone, the Pharisees say, but that the fore-ordination and concurrence of God must be granted;<sup>110</sup> while, according to the doctrine of the Sadducees, the good and evil actions of men are the result of their own free choice, independently of the will and co-operation of God.<sup>111</sup>

The Pharisees, as we have seen, had the greatest influence over the people; indeed, they were in alliance with them,<sup>112</sup> and the women especially were on their side.<sup>113</sup> Their teaching of the Law and their formalism

fell in with the opinions of the crowd. Their agreement among themselves, and their existence everywhere in the country (Luke v. 17); their knowledge of the Law (Acts xxii. 3), and the glory of their seeming holy life; their endeavour, based on principle, to act upon the nation, to renew the life of the people, and to bring on the longed-for day of deliverance; their predominant influence in the Sanhedrin, where they often determined the issue (Acts v. 34, xxiii. 6);<sup>114</sup> their preaching in the forecourt of the Temple and in the Synagogues at Jerusalem, and elsewhere in the country—all this made them the masters of the people, who regarded them as the guardians of the spiritual riches of Judaism, of the pure doctrine, the life of conformity to the Law, the national dignity and freedom. But, notwithstanding, their weakness and their blame lay just in this: that they apprehended everything in a small, sensuous, and external sense; and that, at last, their object became not the renewal of mind and heart, but the self-righteousness of works and obedience to the letter of the Law.

Their especial and infamous distinction is that they conspired to bring Our Lord to the cross (Matthew xxiii. 29-33). They wished for a religious Messiah, but one with their own slavish adherence to the letter; they would have him be political, but only with their particular views. To him whose whole nature and life were in direct antagonism to them, they were bound to be deadly foes, and they did not rest till they had, as they thought, swept him out of their path.

As a ramification of the Pharisees undoubtedly must a party be regarded who, as genuine followers of the

Assideans, sought to prove their patriotism by their energy and zeal, and even by taking up arms. When Cyrenius, the governor of Syria, in the year 6 or 7 of the account called the Christian era, undertook the well-known general 'taxing,' Judas the Galilean, or Gaulonite, in association with a Pharisee named Sadduk, endeavoured to arouse the people not only to resistance against this measure, but to open rebellion against Rome (Acts v. 37). He himself perished in the insurrection, but from that time forth a fanatical party was formed, principally from the ranks of the Pharisees, who inscribed upon their banner war against Rome, and at last brought on the great struggle of the years between A.D. 66 and 70, with its terrible ending. This was the party of Zealots as they were called. Its adherents of course understood by the expected Messiah a deliverer who should be above all a political personage, a Jewish king. Hence Our Lord had to face the question whether he should fall in with their views and aims; but before his entrance upon his public work he in principle separated himself from all political strifes (Matthew iv. 8-10). This is the explanation of his unwillingness to be proclaimed as the Messiah in Judæa and Galilee (Matthew xvi. 20); while in Samaria, where the feeling of the people was much more favourable to Rome, such precautions were not necessary (John iv. 26). For the same evident reason he retreated to some mountain solitude when the people, probably some of the party of Zealots, wished to take him by force and make him a king (John vi. 15). It is thought that they who raised the cry of "Hosanna" may have been adherents of the same party (Matthew xxi. 1-11).

Moreover, that Jesus was falsely accused before Pilate as belonging to the anti-Roman party (Luke xxiii. 14, compare John xviii. 28 *et seq.*) is evident from the record of his trial and the inscription on the cross: "This is Jesus the King of the Jews." Even some of his disciples at first shared the political views of the party. Simon of Cana, for example, bore the surname of "Zelotes" (Mark iii. 18, Luke vi. 15), that is, Simon the Zealot; and we remember the petition of the mother of Zebedee's children, that her two sons might sit one on the right hand and one on the left in the coming kingdom of Jesus, which she evidently regarded as a political one (Matthew xx. 20); and also the saying of the two disciples, on their way to Emmaus: "We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel!"—that is from the hated dominion of Rome, and by making himself king.

If the Zealots, however, were the enemies of the Romans it is certain that Rome had her friends and adherents, and that amongst those who were considered the 'well-disposed' of the land. To this class belonged many persons of high rank among the priestly aristocracy, many of the rich laity, and especially many of the influential men of business. These were in sympathy with the Roman rule for the sake of the personal advantage which they found in pliable yielding to the established order of things. Many of them had been in Rome and had travelled about the world, and since they had everywhere met with the power of the Empire they had become its friends.

That the house of the Herods had also a certain



number of adherents on their side has been already noticed.<sup>115</sup>

But in comparison with the Pharisees, the party who were loyal to the Roman Government, and that of the Herodians did not prosper. Even the Sadducees, who formed the other great party, were far below the Pharisees in numbers and influence. Whence the Sadducees derived their name, how long they had been in existence, and who had been their founder, is involved in some uncertainty. Some think that, like the Pharisees, they claimed for themselves a title of honour in their designation, and that the Hebrew name, *Saddukim*, is derived from *tsedakah*, 'righteousness,' and meant that they were the righteous, but the derivation is grammatically hardly possible. A Jewish tradition, unfortunately rather a late one, assumes that a certain Zadok, the pupil of Antigonus of Socho, was their founder. The most probable theory, however, is that which supposes their name to be derived from Zadok who was High Priest in David's time (II. Samuel viii. 17); and that thus the Sadducees were the Zadokites, the descendants and adherents of the ancient priestly-aristocratic house of Zadok which from the time of David and Solomon down to the exile, and again, after the restoration, from the days of Ezra to the time of the Syrian dominion, inherited the office of High Priest.<sup>116</sup> They lost the position in the disturbed times of the second century before Christ, when it was taken by the Maccabean heroes, who richly deserved it. The efforts of the Zadokites, however, to regain their lost dignity were not fruitless, and in the time of Jesus we again find men of

their kindred and school occupying the office of High Priest, such as an Annas and a Caiaphas (Acts v. 17). In contrast with the Pharisees, who found their adherents chiefly among the people, the Sadducees were especially the priestly-aristocratic party, and numbered amongst them, beside the High Priest, the majority of the priesthood and of the higher classes among the Jewish people.<sup>117</sup> Josephus says : "The Sadducees have not the people on their side, but win over the well-to-do and highest in rank."<sup>118</sup> They cannot, however, as some have thought, be regarded as latitudinarians or freethinkers,<sup>119</sup> in distinction from the Pharisees, since their attitude was much more that of Conservatives in relation to the Mosaic ordinances. They took part, in virtue of their official standing, in the services at the Temple and at the altar, observed the stated rules respecting circumcision and the Sabbath, and adhered firmly to the Scripture, not only to the Pentateuch, which they preferred above all the rest, but also to the other Sacred Books.<sup>120</sup> They were distinguished from the Pharisees by this, that they rejected the Oral Law, which consisted of the "traditions of the elders," and would only receive the Sacred Books as of Divine authority ; or, as Josephus characterizes their party : "The Sadducees say that we ought to hold only that which is written to be the Law, and give no heed to the new rules or traditions of the fathers."<sup>121</sup> Thus they rejected the Pharisaic interpretations of the Scripture, and all augmentations of it founded on tradition ; and, on the contrary, continued to hold by the simple letter of the Law. Where the Pharisees, by their exposition of the Law, sometimes lightened for the people the burden of its

obligations, the Sadducees insisted with emphasis on the strictest observance of it by the multitude, whilst they allowed to the priesthood liberty from many of its restrictions. Besides the traditions of the fathers, they rejected decidedly the new specific rules of faith and morality which were held by the Pharisees. They denied, as we have seen, the influence of destiny, and affirmed that good and evil, with the power to do the one or the other, depend upon our will.<sup>122</sup> They rejected also the doctrine of the resurrection and eternal life, as well as the existence of angels and spirits (see page 132); instead of which they held the old Mosaic view, of earthly recompense and happiness, of immortality through long life, numerous descendants, and unceasing earthly public welfare. Satisfied themselves with the precepts of the Law, they scorned the new means and expedients of piety adopted by the Pharisees—the troublesome fastings, the numberless purifications, and the absorption in merely external acts. Once, when the Pharisees immersed in water the golden chandeliers of the Temple, the Sadducees cried out: “See, the Pharisees will purify the sun at last!” In relation to the various religious usages, to the manner in which incense should be used and the water of purification sprinkled, and the daily morning and evening sacrifice managed, &c., they were not so rigid as the Pharisees, but kept to the precepts of the Law, and not to the special rules of tradition. Although many a zealous Pharisee held them to be unclean because of this neglect, they were not in the least regarded by the people as on that account unfit for their offices as High Priests, priests, and judges.

In their public character the Pharisees appeared condescending, national, and liberal ; the Sadducees, on the contrary, were haughty, brusque with one another, more attached to the world and rigorous in judgment. The former wished, by active piety, to prepare for eternal life ; the latter recognized only the present, and demanded integrity and ability of mind. Apart from their official life, the Sadducees allowed themselves a good deal of liberty, had no objection to the pleasures of a well-furnished table, took part in life at the court of the Herods, and did not make too great a hardship of any contact with heathenism. Among the people, this party was only looked up to in so far as it could boast of hereditary nobility and class privileges. Otherwise their aristocratic school was but little liked, on account of their suspicious and scanty creed, their arrogance, and their severity, especially as judges.

With their aversion to every form of enthusiasm, the Sadducees must have hated Jesus as a fanatic ; and with their denial of immortality, of resurrection, and the existence of angels, they were dogmatically opposite to him. Their antagonism to him and John the Baptist, from both causes, is evident. The latter calls them, as well as the Pharisees, a "generation of vipers" (Matthew iii. 7) ; and Jesus describes them as hypocrites, a "wicked and adulterous generation ;" and their doctrines as a leaven which corrupted the people (Matthew xvi. 6). In the Acts of the Apostles also they appear as the consistent enemies of the Christian religion. While many Pharisees, like Nicodemus, sought and found the Lord (John iii. 2, xix. 39 ; Luke xxiii. 50), and Paul, who had been one of

them, became his Apostle—none of the Sadducees, so far as we know, ever made the great change (compare Acts iv. 1, v. 17, xxiii. 6-9).

Besides the Pharisees and Sadducees, there was another party who are referred to by Josephus and others, the Essenes (Essenoi,<sup>123</sup> Essaioi<sup>124</sup>) as they are called, a name which is not mentioned in the Scriptures. Their origin is lost in the obscurity of the pre-Christian period, like that of the other parties. It is possible that Essenism developed itself first in the time of the Maccabees, especially under Jonathan (B.C. 162-143), a supposition which Josephus seems to point to.<sup>125</sup> The first Essenian called by that name is a certain Judas of the time of Antigonus, about B.C. 110.<sup>126</sup> The signification of the party name is uncertain; some derive it from the Hebrew "*asai*," that is, "physician," because they practised medicine, but this explanation only fits one of their minor peculiarities. Others connect the name with "*chasa*," that is, 'silence,' because their piety was of a taciturn character. The most probable explanation is that the Essenes designated themselves from the Syriac as "*chasen*," that is the religious.

They formed a separate and secluded society, whose great object was the cultivation of the religious life, an association of ascetics, who remind us of the monastic orders which afterwards arose in Christendom. Various causes doubtless contributed to that result. For one thing the feeling of dissatisfaction with Pharisaism, the special type of Jewish piety; then their displeasure at the worldly and faithless policy of Jonathan, which showed such a deep falling off from the spirit and purpose of the

first Maccabees ; and lastly their acquaintance with the principles and views of the Pythagorean sect of moralists, with which Essenism manifested a certain affinity. For although they had, as we shall see more fully a little further on, much in common with Judaism, and shared especially the principles of the Pharisees with regard to the supreme importance of the Law, the strict observance of the Sabbath and ceremonial purifications, it is still true that any explanation of Essenism which does not take in more than its Jewish elements, is by no means sufficient. Their fundamental conception of Nature and the human life was a kind of dualism, and their ascetic practices aimed at the utmost possible avoidance of contact with matter, and the prevention of ceremonial defilement by it. The body to them was earthly and perishable ; the soul, which they thought of as proceeding from the most subtle ether, was immortal and eternal, but shut up in the body as in a prison. This view was also held by the Pythagoreans, and there was still more in Essenism which was closely related with the principles of that school of moral philosophy, such as the rejection of bloody sacrifices, the abstinence from flesh and wine, their views of celibacy, their refusal to take an oath, their prayers to the sun, the wearing of white garments and other peculiarities. How the Pythagorean principles found their way into Palestine, whether by way of Syria, or Alexandria in Egypt, is not known. If the latter was the true direction, then the Jewish sect of Therapeutæ<sup>127</sup> in Egypt may have been the forerunner of the Essenes, who were in harmony with them on many points ; but there was this great difference between them,



that the former led an entirely meditative life, while the latter (the Essenes) devoted themselves to industrial activity.<sup>128</sup> The latest researches, however, would almost seem to show that the book attributed to Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, the only source of information respecting the Therapeutæ, was not written by him, but by some Christian, who was strongly in favour of asceticism, at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century; and that the author is seeking to glorify not a Jewish sect, but the Christian ascetics and anchorites; so that the supposition of a connection between the Therapeutæ and the Essenes has not much foundation.<sup>129</sup>

There were in the Holy land, in the days of Josephus, about four thousand Essenes;<sup>130</sup> they had their communities in the cities, but especially in the villages, of Palestine, and, as Philo mentions, even in Syria also. They preferred, however, above all the retired and solitary districts, and hence the wilderness of Engedi, to the west of the Dead Sea, became one of their chief settlements, to which at a later time they migrated in large numbers.<sup>131</sup>

In the earlier days of their history they seem to have taken some part in public life, but as time went on they became more and more estranged from it, and grew into a narrow and exclusive monastic society, with a severe discipline and a rigid organization. They emulated the Pharisees in their zeal for the restoration of the righteousness of the Law and of ceremonial purity, but were at the same time sincere and earnest in cultivating the religious life.

Turning our attention now to their more peculiar views

and practices, it is right to say that they cherished the greatest reverence for Jehovah, and held faithfully by Moses and his laws. They kept aloof from the Temple, but all the same presented their gifts and votive offerings for it, with the exception of animals for sacrifice. They strictly observed the laws of the Sabbath, and those concerning drinks and meats, and rejected with horror all images, even those stamped on coins. They made abuse or reviling of the Law of Moses an offence punishable by death, and in their ceremonial purifications they went even beyond the requirements of the Law. For them, life's greatest task was to emancipate themselves from the earthly, which they regarded as anti-godly; their gaze and their prayers were often turned to heaven and to the sun; their aim was to become like God and the angels. The body was for them only matter doomed to destruction, while the soul, destined to live on for ever, looked forward to a 'recompense of reward' beyond death.

In their life and practice the Essenes showed themselves moderate, simple in their habits, having but few wants and diligent in industry. Their diet was limited to bread, fruit, and vegetables, with perhaps a little salt and hyssop; they refused to drink wine or eat flesh. Their clothing consisted of a white linen garment. They mostly abstained from marriage; or, at the best, a small branch of them allowed themselves to enter upon it under certain conditions. The decease of members was as a rule made good by the adoption of children, and by the voluntary entrance of new adherents. They were zealous for moral purity, chastity, and truthfulness, for which reason they rejected the custom of taking oaths. In

their communities all property was held for the common good, so that for all there was only one fund and one store, which was managed by a steward, and from which all could draw under certain regulations; and thus neither poverty nor riches were to be seen among them. All forms of slavery were to them an abomination of unrighteousness. The aged, the sick, and those in need of help they waited upon like sons and daughters; charity was a sacred duty which they felt bound to fulfil, and, whilst in all else every step that they must take was regulated by the laws of their society, two things were fully in the power of every member: to be charitable and helpful. Their energetic and healthful labour protected them from lust and indolence. By occupation they were principally agriculturists, shepherds, bee-keepers, and handicraftsmen; they had a contempt for trade which they considered conducive to avarice, and for smiths' work in armoury, by which men are injured.

In their associations they had superintendents, priests, and other officials, and the whole society was divided into separate classes, those below consisting of novices, and those above of brethren who were fully members of the order. When anyone wished to be taken into the society, he had first of all to undergo a probation of one year, upon which he was admitted to the ceremonial purifications. Then followed a further probation of two years, at the expiration of which he could take his place at the common table and was admitted to all the privileges and rites of the order.

Very simple, but at the same time full of vitality, was the daily life of the members of this society. Before

sunrise they spoke of nothing secular, but first of all prayed together, and looked up to the heavens towards the physical and the spiritual sun; then everyone proceeded to his labour. Towards mid-day the ceremonial washings took place, and thereupon all sat down to the common meals in the houses of the order, all alike wearing white robes. The afternoon was again devoted to diligent labour, and not till the twilight did they leave it off and assemble again for the evening meal. On the Sabbaths they rested entirely from all work, and spent the time in common prayer and the reading and interpretation of the Law.

In the life and religion of the Essenes there was much that is worthy of honourable recognition; but it is nevertheless true that Essenism was a morbid enthusiasm for technical purity and a morose retreat from the world. The abhorrence of what they deemed uncleanness erected an insurmountable wall of separation between the Essenes and the rest of the people. They lived and died for themselves alone; they sought their own calm and repose in this world, and the salvation of their souls in the other; while they condemned the morals and customs of the country. And thus it was that in numbers they never approached the Pharisees, that they took no part in caring for the welfare of their native land, and held aloof from the great struggle which involved the very existence of their own people. Even after the destruction of Jerusalem this party continued to exist in peace and obscurity, and only came to an end in the fifth century.

The supposition which some have indulged that Our Lord himself had lent an ear to the teachings of the

Essenes is entirely unfounded : to this hour no valid reason has been adduced in support of it. The Christian religion is absolutely different from Essenism ; it does not forbid our being *in* the world, but our being *of* the world ; and the particulars we have given will clearly show the distinction between the teachings of Jesus and those of the Essenes. On the other hand it is credible that the ancient heretical Christian sect of the Sampsæans, or Elcesaites, who were sun-worshippers, living near the Dead Sea, may have been formed by a blending together of Essenian and Ebionite elements.

If now we take a review of the stirring activities of the period among the children of Israel, we may say with Keim : "They are at once an evidence of decline and decay, and of internal preparedness for rebuilding."<sup>132</sup> The decay is seen in the motley diversity of views, in the despairing struggle for a deliverance, which was sought chiefly in external prosperity, and also in the devotion to the bare letter of the Law and superficial formalities. There was undoubtedly much fidelity and exactness in the works of the Law, much of the sacrificing spirit, but also still more of vanity and conceit, hypocrisy and sanctimoniousness. We know that Jesus strongly condemned the people of his time, and St. Paul after him did the same (Matthew xii. 39, Romans ii. 23-24). Roman writers, such as Cicero, Suetonius, and Tacitus speak often of the decaying Jewish people. And even Josephus confesses the decline of his nation since the time of the Maccabees. The external misery in the country, and the inward distress in men's hearts, awakened in most of them a feeling of their utter inability to help

themselves, and at the same time an ardent desire for Him whose coming had been predicted for centuries—the Messiah. And thus, underneath all the external formalism, and especially among the better sort, there was an increasing movement of men's souls awakened and nourished by the confident hope of the coming Saviour. The Messianic hope is therefore the subject to which we must next give our attention.

---

## VII.

### THE MESSIANIC HOPE.

WHEN we are oppressed by anxiety, fear, or distress, we naturally lift up our eyes to heaven, supplicating and hoping that the future may be brighter, and may compensate us for the sorrowful character of the present. But above all do we cling to the hope of a kinder future when we think we have definite grounds for belief in the more favourable conditions of the coming time.

And certainly the "chosen people" experienced trouble enough in the last centuries of their history. If we could imagine and realize to ourselves their great trials, the struggles of the Maccabean times, the internal dissensions among the people themselves, their sufferings under the Roman rule from Pompey to Vespasian,—to which was added the despotic and Rome-serving rule of Herod and his successors—the cringing spirit of the Jewish aristocracy, the antagonism of parties, and the many hardships which



families and individuals had to bear,—all this would abundantly prove that Palestine was no longer a land flowing with milk and honey. And at the time when they had to bear external trouble in many forms, their inward need and distress of soul were greatest and most oppressive. The people strove for righteousness, for peace of heart, for the certainty of salvation, and yet never reached by the Law, by their pious practices, nor by all their outward works, what they longed for—the blessed rest of the soul. New ways were sought out, and the right one never discovered. They found their great comfort now, for this outward and inward misery, in the ancient predictions and promises ; and the conviction expressed by the woman of Samaria, at Jacob's well, was that of many in Israel : “ I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ : when he is come he will tell us all things ” (John iv. 25). They looked forward now more than ever to deliverance from the yoke of foreign rule, to better times politically, and also to peaceful and blessed days which should bring healing and life to their souls.

And they might well cherish such a hope ; for it was founded upon the Scriptures, upon the writings of the Law and the Prophets, on which the brightest expectations might be built, and the promises of devoted men of God, whose veracity was not open to doubt. The greater the outward and inward pressure, the more living and ardent, as we have seen, became the desire and the hope of deliverance from it ; and thus we find that just before, and at the time of Jesus, the hearts of all Israelites were filled with longing for the speedy coming of Him, of whom the prophets spake, the Messiah, whose advent

would be the dawn of a new day of salvation and happiness.

It is characteristic that the Messianic hope, which at the bottom rested upon the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, was, in the time of which we speak, chiefly sustained and stimulated by the utterances of the book of Daniel, by some intimations in the Apocrypha, and especially by the so-called *apocalyptic* books.

These latter were writings which, professedly on the ground of Divine revelation, gave in enigmatical and obscure language information about the mysteries of Nature, of human life and the kingdom of God. They were fitted to console and strengthen men's minds amidst the troubles of the present by the announcement of the near approach of the heavenly kingdom and the judgment of the wicked. As if to keep the word of ancient prophecy alive, and to impress it on the minds of the people, it was repeated in many books, down to the time of Our Lord, such as the apocryphal works of Enoch, Baruch, and Esdras; and even found its way into the Jewish portion of the heathen "Sibylline verses." From all we know it is evident that the Messianic expectation had especially developed itself in the two last centuries before the Christian Era, and that in the time of Jesus it was everywhere alive and stirring in the minds of the Jews.

One of the best read and favourite books of the period was, as is evident from Josephus,<sup>133</sup> the Book of Daniel. It was a prophecy of comparatively recent date, containing predictions of a time coming in which the most powerful heathen kingdoms of the earth, of which four are

mentioned under the metaphor of mighty beasts (Daniel vii. 2-27), will be broken in pieces and destroyed; and when in their place a kingdom shall be established by God, which shall stand for ever (Daniel ii. 44). The "saints of the most High" are to receive the kingdom and "possess it for ever and ever" (Daniel vii. 18). A "time of trouble," such as never was before, is to precede the day of deliverance, but at last all the people of God are to share in the great Salvation (Daniel xii. 1); the righteous dead are to awake, and arise from their graves, and enter into eternal life, while the wicked shall rise to "shame and everlasting contempt" (verse 2). Whether the author thought of a Messianic prince as at the head of this kingdom cannot be made out with certainty from his vision recorded in chapter vii. Many expositors, from ancient times till now, understand by the expression "the Son of Man" (chapter vii. 13), the founder and ruler of the kingdom of God. The language of Jesus himself confirms that interpretation (Matthew viii. 20; xxvi. 64; Luke xxi. 27), and is thought to refer to the passage cited from Daniel. Others think that, in contrast with the symbolical beasts, the "Son of Man, coming in the clouds of heaven," may be understood as meaning the holy people, "the saints of the most High," to whom the heavenly kingdom is given, and that the words of the Book itself support the view (compare chapter vii. 18, 27; ii. 44). It was nothing strange, however, that the Jews should read glowing prophecies of their Messiah in the Book of Daniel.

The apocryphal Scriptures of the Old Testament also contain evidences—although, by reason of their historical

character, only in a few intimations—of the hope in the speedy coming of deliverance from trouble by the hands of a personal liberator. The scattered children of Israel are to be gathered together at Jerusalem, from distant lands, to worship the Lord their God (Baruch iv. 36 ; II. Maccabees ii. 18 ; Tobit xiii. 10-14) ; the posterity of David are to possess the kingdom for ever (I. Maccabees ii. 57). Especially significant is the statement in I. Maccabees iv. 46, that Judas Maccabeus adopted certain measures, provisionally, “until there should come a Prophet to show what should be done ;” and the fact stated in chapter xiv. 41, of the same book, that Simon accepted the office of High Priest and Prince of the Jews, with the condition that he should hold it “until there should arise a faithful Prophet,” who should be the highest among the people.

All this shows that the promised Deliverer was regarded not merely as a religious, but also as a political and theocratic Messiah.

The religion of the Jews was inseparably linked with the constitution of their State, so that they could not imagine a Messiah who was not destined to fill a pre-eminent place in the political history of the nation ; and we can easily understand how the political features of the Messianic kingdom were for the multitude in the foreground of the picture.

Among the apocalyptic writings which we have already mentioned, were the so-called Sibylline prophecies, a collection of predictions in poetic form, after the model of the heathen Oracles. Some of them contain Christian elements belonging to the first century ; but the oldest portions, especially parts of Book III. (verses 632-807), are

really of Jewish origin, and were probably written by a Jew of Alexandria, about B.C. 140. These contain numerous utterances about the coming Messianic period. A king is to appear, who shall put an end to war in all the earth. The heathen, who will once more assemble themselves against Jerusalem, are to perish miserably. Under the protection of the heaven-sent king, peace and rest are to be given to Israel ; and afterwards the Gentile peoples also shall be brought to reverence God and His Temple. At last God will establish upon the earth an eternal kingdom of peace, into which all men shall be gathered.

The apocryphal Book of Enoch, which was well known in the time of Jesus, and may have been written about B.C. 130, speaks often of the appearance of the "Chosen one," the "Anointed," the "Son of man," and the "Tree of righteousness ;" and prophesies that the Messianic theocracy is near at hand. Yet once more, will the heathen try their strength against Israel, but in vain. All seducers, all oppressors and all apostates are to be cast down into a deep pit full of fire. A new Jerusalem is to arise, wherein the godly Israelites shall dwell, and the heathen do homage to them ; and then the Messiah shall appear, and all the world be converted to God (compare Jude 14 and 15).

Another source of information as to what was passing in the minds of the children of Israel, in the last century, before Christ, is the so-called "Psalter of Solomon," which sets in a clear light the mind of the better sort among them especially. These psalms had their origin at the time when Pompey subdued Palestine to the

Roman Power, and allowed the Asmoneans no hope for the future. All the hopes of the Psalmist are set on that which he, in common with all the faithful of the land, ardently desires, the subjugation of the foreigner by a king of David's race, who shall tolerate no heathenism and no unrighteousness among the people. Under his rule all are to be sanctified, for he shall be the "Anointed of the Lord," whom God will make wise and mighty by His Holy Spirit, and who will, therefore, strike down the foe by the word of his mouth—a king of righteousness and truth, who shall lead all into integrity, holiness, and happiness.

Reference may also be made to the Targums (that is, "translations") of Onkelos and Jonathan, which, as is well known, were more or less free paraphrases of the Pentateuch and the Prophets in the Aramaic dialect. Although they were composed at a later period than the books we have already cited, it is certain that in them "materials are turned to account, on whose production many generations had laboured, and which cover a period extending to the apostolic age, and even beyond it."<sup>134</sup> We may therefore regard many of the expectations which are expressed in these books as having been current in the time of Jesus. Many passages of the Old Testament are evidently understood in a Messianic sense; and it is especially significant that Onkelos renders the mysterious name "*Shiloh*" (Genesis xlix. 10) by Messiah, and expects the prophecy to be fulfilled as soon as the sceptre shall be taken away from Judah. And this was the national opinion in the days of Jesus (compare John vi. 14; i. 19; vii. 31; Acts xiii. 32, &c). The prediction, concerning



the "Star of Jacob" (Numbers xxiv. 17), is also understood by Onkelos as referring to the coming Messianic King. And Jonathan regards the last words of David (II. Samuel xxiii. 3 and 4) as a prophecy relating to the time of the Messiah. He calls the Messiah the "Hero," the "King" (compare Isaiah ix. 6), who shall deliver the people from their Pagan foes. He makes the striking passage in Isaiah xi. 1 and 2, refer to the Messiah as the great teacher, and understands chapter liii. 5 to describe him as the forgiver of sins. The time of the Messiah is, according to him, to be one of holiness and righteousness. At last the coming king will separate the godly from the ungodly, leading the first to eternal life, and the latter to deserved punishment.

The same magnificent prospects for Israel's future are expressed in the book called "The Ascension of Moses," which was composed shortly before the birth of Jesus. In a highly poetical delineation, it describes the kingdom of God as coming after a time of great misery and oppression, when the celestial king will arise from his throne and chastise the heathen and destroy their gods. And then Israel shall prosper, and in his gladness give thanks to the Lord.

In a similar general way the "Book of Jubilees," which originated shortly after the death of Jesus, describes first the unspeakable misery, and after that the glory that shall follow in the Messianic age.

The Jewish community in Alexandria were filled with the brightest hopes of a better future which should dawn with the coming of the Messiah. Their principal representative, Philo, speaks explicitly about it in two of his

writings.<sup>135</sup> He says in the first that all who are converted to the Law of God shall be gathered together in an appointed place (Jerusalem); a divine and superhuman phenomenon, only visible to the saved, will lead them to the spot. The ruined cities will be built up again, the desert wastes again inhabited, and the barren land become a fruitful field. In a passage of the other book, he describes a time of prosperity and peace, as a day in which men will be safe from wild beasts, and when unity and concord shall dwell amongst them. A man will come forth, says the prediction (compare Numbers xxiv. 17), who shall take the field and make war, overcoming great and populous nations, while God Himself sends aid. The saints will possess holiness, power, and benevolence, and thereby beget reverence, fear, and love. Wealth and prosperity, health and physical energy, will fall to the lot of the godly in the Messianic time.

It is certainly remarkable and peculiar that Josephus, to whom we are much indebted for his work on the Antiquities of the Jews and his History of the Great War, is almost silent about the expectations which existed at that time; and, indeed, intentionally avoids referring explicitly to the Messianic predictions. The expression in the well-known passage,<sup>136</sup> which may be interpreted in a Messianic sense ("This was the Christ") may either be only an interpolation, or may simply mean: "This was the Messiah of the popular belief." One thing, however, is conceded by Josephus, that the hope of a Messiah strengthened and supported the Jews in the decisive struggle at Jerusalem;<sup>137</sup> and it is also his hope, as he intimates when giving an account of Baalam's prophecy,

that his people are destined to spread over the whole earth, and to gain victory and power. His shy and reserved attitude in relation to the expectations of his people may be due to the fact that his works were intended for the Romans, and that he did not wish to beget in their minds any suspicion of rebellious intentions among the Jews, still less to get himself into discredit with the emperor, whose favour he endeavoured by every means to win and retain. Would he, in opposition to the views of all his people, have applied the Messianic prophecies to Vespasian as the true king of Israel,<sup>133</sup> if it had not been to do homage to him and court his favour?

That the Jewish people notoriously looked and waited for the arrival of the Messianic period is evident, not only from the statements of the books we have cited, but also from the expressions of even heathen authors, such as the well-known passages in Tacitus,<sup>139</sup> in Suetonius,<sup>140</sup> and in Virgil.<sup>141</sup> Moreover, the attempts of some men—such as Theudas (Acts v. 36), or the pseudo-prophets, about A.D. 70—to give themselves out as the true Saviour, and the extent to which they were believed in by the multitude, are further evidences of the expectations of the Jews. Even in the last hour of the assault upon the Temple a lying prophet gathered six thousand men around him on the pretence that he was going to be their deliverer. That the people did not give up their hope of a great deliverance, even after the destruction of the city, is shown by the apocalyptic writings of Baruch and the fourth Book of Esdras, which there is reason to believe had their origin shortly after the catastrophe at Jerusalem; and also by the daily prayer of the Jews, which, among other

things, contains the petition for the coming of the Son of David and the establishment of his kingdom. They continued to hope even after they had rejected Him who was truly the Messiah of his people, and Prophet, Priest, and King in one great personality—not, it is true, a King of this world, but King of kings and Lord of the kingdom of heaven (Matthew xxvii. 11 ; John xviii. 36, 37).

This leads us back to the times when Jesus lived upon the earth, and to the Messianic views which the New Testament brings before us. That just in this period men's hopes were fixed more than ever upon the Messiah, we may see by many intimations and declarations of the Gospels. The question of John the Baptist: "Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?" (Matthew xi. 3 ; compare John vii. 29) shows clearly that the desire and expectation was rooted in men's minds. The most prominent and general feature here, also, was that the Deliverer was thought of as one who should restore the national independence and greatness of the people of Israel. The disciples could not give up such hopes even after the resurrection (Luke xxiv. 21) ; this is shown by the utterances of the two who were on the way to Emmaus, and by the fact that even on the day of the ascension the disciples questioned Jesus: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts i. 6). With the same view the multitude wished to "take him by force to make him a king" (John vi. 15). It was because they believed him to be the Messiah that the people acclaimed him on his entrance into Jerusalem. This was the pretext for his accusation before Pilate, as seditious and dangerous to the State, and his being put to the ques-

tion, whether he claimed to be the King of the Jews? (Luke xxiii. 2, 3; Matthew xxvii. 11; John xviii. 33). And when the council of chief priests and Pharisees say: "If we let this man alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation" (John xi. 48), it teaches us that the name of the Messiah was easily linked with possible political agitations, and that his enemies among the Jews had some apparent ground for pretending that the popular recognition of Jesus, as a political king, would occasion a revolution.

But we should be mistaken if we regarded the Messiah of Jewish expectation as only a king of the State. In the minds, especially of the better sort among them and the more deeply interested, the office had a higher significance. John the Baptist declared that one (the Messiah) was coming after him who was "preferred before him," who was "mightier than he," whose "shoe's latchet he was not worthy to unloose;" but who should "baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire" (Matthew iii. 11; Mark i. 7; John i. 27); and thus he placed the Messiah far above himself and every other man. Especially did "such as were quiet in the land," the godly in Israel, place their whole confidence in the promises of the Scripture (Luke i. 70-79), and hope for a Messiah who would not only be a deliverer from external enemies, but also a Saviour from unrighteousness and perdition. Zacharias, in his song of praise (Luke i. 67 etc.), speaks of the visitation and redemption of his people from the hand of all who hated them; but declares that the object of that deliverance was that they might "serve God in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life," their sins being forgiven

and their feet "led into the way of peace." And how heartfelt is the gratitude of the aged Simeon for the fulfilment of his greatest hope when he exclaims : "Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word : for mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared before the face of all people ; a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel" (Luke ii. 29-32) ! How well the thanksgiving of Anna, the God-fearing widow of eighty-four years, harmonizes with Simeon's word, when she, "coming in that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem" (Luke ii. 36) ! And of such religious, trustful, and hoping souls there were certainly not a few in the land who, on the ground of prophetic promises, held firmly to the belief that now the day of salvation, not merely of political but of moral and spiritual deliverance, was not far off ; and that the desire of all hearts would soon appear in their midst as the Redeemer, the Saviour, and the Light of the world.

People of some note in the country, like the "honourable counsellor," Joseph of Arimathea, also "waited for the kingdom of God" (Mark xv. 43) ; as well as the more lowly people, some of whom afterwards became the disciples of Jesus. There were times also when some conception of the higher Messiahship of Jesus flashed upon the minds of his disciples, notwithstanding their political views and expectations. Not only did Peter, speaking for himself and the others, once declare : "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew xvi. 16), but at another time the disciples in a body were constrained



to confess that he had fulfilled their highest hopes (Matthew xiv. 33). In the same way Martha (John xi. 27) and Nathaniel (John i. 49), acknowledged the Lord as the Christ, the Son of God, and the King of Israel. And when even the tempter and the demons speak of him as the Christ and the Son of God (Matthew iv. 3, 6 ; Luke iv. 41), they show very evidently that this was the character in which the Messiah was expected to appear at that time ; they make use of expressions which were customary in the mouths of the people. Also from the solemn question of Caiaphas : "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God !" (Matthew xxvi. 63) we can only conclude that the Jews expected the Messiah to be the King of Israel and the Son of God. And do not the scornful words spoken at the foot of the cross point to the same conclusion (Matthew xxvii. 40) ? That some at another time should say : "When Christ cometh no man knoweth whence he is" (John vii. 27), must be explained as a presentiment on their part of the mysterious exalted origin and Divine dignity of the Messiah ; since, as regards his earthly origin, it was well known from the Scriptures that Bethlehem was to be his birth-place (Micah v. 2 ; Matthew ii. 4 ; John vii. 42). And when others say with reference to the works of Jesus : "When Christ cometh will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done ?" (John vii. 31) it indicates that the Messiah was expected to do mighty works. It is plain that the people also looked for a Messiah who would be filled with the spirit of prophecy, and so characterized him when speaking of his advent (John vi. 14 ; Matthew xxi. 11). That the

gifts of prophecy and oratory were ascribed to the Messiah may be inferred from the fact that the false Messiahs, who arose at a later period, gave themselves out as prophets, and were so designated by the people. The Samaritans also expected the Messiah to be a prophet. As their religious opinions were founded entirely on the Pentateuch, they derived their Messianic hopes altogether from Moses, and comforted themselves down to the time of Jesus with the prediction; "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren" (Deuteronomy xviii. 15). That they thought of the Messiah as above all a holy teacher, a prophet who would instruct them in all things, is evident from the language of the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well (John iv. 25, 29, 42). Finally, we know from the Gospels (Matthew xx. 28; John i. 29, iii. 14), from Paul (I. Corinthians xv. 3; Galatians i. 4; Romans v. 6; compare Isaiah liii. 8, 9), and from the epistle to the Hebrews (chapter vii. 27 and ix. 12), that the Christ was to be a great High Priest and a Mediator between man and God. The numerous passages, familiar to all, which might be quoted on this subject, make it evident that the idea of the high-priesthood of the Messiah was everywhere a familiar one in the minds of the people.

After the evidences which we have adduced from the abundant testimony which exists, it cannot be doubted that nothing was so powerful and moving in the time when Jesus came as the longing desire for the fulfilment of the predictions laid down in the Sacred Books, and newly revived in the later writings to which we have referred. In all circles people were waiting and hoping

for the Messiah. To many, it is true, he was only the expected deliverer from outward misery, a king who should liberate the people from foreign rule, and restore prosperity and happiness to the country. But a more spiritual conception inspired the minds of many, an image of a sublimer spiritual Messiah, one who should bring healing to the soul, peace to the conscience, and lead men into Divine blessedness.

Notwithstanding all that may be said, however, the hope of the people was never equal to the reality. He who fulfilled it was greater than all their expectations. Far above all that the Jews thought of, was the work of Him at whose appearance the angels sang: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men" (Luke ii. 14). Our Lord Jesus Christ was in truth the great deliverer come from God, who brought salvation and happiness not only for Israel but for all mankind. Mournful and terrible is the truth, that after all the real Messiah had to look down upon Jerusalem from the heights of Olivet and utter that pathetic and awful lamentation in which the yearning of an infinite pity blends with the stern severity of just necessity: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate" (Matthew xxiii. 37, 38). Thanks be to God, His light beamed forth from Israel into all parts of the world, banishing the darkness and illumining even to this hour the way that leads to the Eternal Light!

## VIII.

## THE JEWS IN THE DISPERSION.

THE native land and chief home of the Jewish race was Palestine, with the capital city of Jerusalem. But we should greatly err if we imagined that no Jews were to be found elsewhere. A multitude of them were scattered abroad in the so-called *diaspora*, or dispersion (John vii. 35 ; James i. 1) ; and indeed the number of Jews who were settled in countries and cities outside of Palestine was as great or even greater than the population of the Holy Land itself. Many of the Jews did not avail themselves of the permission given by Cyrus for their return from the great exile ; it was chiefly the tribes of Judah and Benjamin who again sought out their native land. The rest of the tribes for the most part preferred to remain in their new home on the other side of the Euphrates. Since that time great numbers had migrated from Palestine west, south, and north, so that the Jewish people were scattered over almost all parts of the Roman Empire. Hence Josephus speaks of the habitable world being full of them, and quotes Strabo, as saying that it was "hard to find a place in the earth that had not admitted this tribe of men, and was not possessed by them."<sup>142</sup> And Philo writes : "The Jews are not as other nations, shut up within the circumference of one country, they inhabit almost all the world, and have poured forth

into all continents and islands.”<sup>143</sup> A passage in Acts ii, 5-12 bears powerful testimony to this fact.

In Assyria, Media, Babylonia, and Mesopotamia, thousands of Jews resided. In the low countries of the Euphrates they carried on agriculture and cattle farming; and trade, in places situated on any of the great routes of commerce. Nisibis and Nearda are especially spoken of as great Jewish centres, in which there were treasuries for the reception of offerings intended for the Temple, which were annually conveyed to Jerusalem under the escort of thousands of armed men.<sup>144</sup> There were also many Jews in what was then the kingdom of Adiabene, now known as Kurdistan, lying to the north and east of the Tigris; and many heathens became proselytes to the Jewish faith. Indeed the king himself, Izates, and his mother, Helena, went over to Judaism about the time of the death of Jesus.<sup>145</sup> On this side the Euphrates there was a Jewish population in many places, especially in Palmyra; and even in the province of Yemen, in Arabia Felix, there were already flourishing Jewish settlements in the second century before Christ. It is possible that the Apostle Paul, after his conversion at Damascus, laboured for three years in the work of the Gospel among the Jews in Arabia (Galatians i. 17, 18). Moreover, all the cities which had been conquered by Alexander the Great and his generals in Asia were partly inhabited by Jewish colonists. Here their settlement was favoured by the friendly disposition of the great king, who granted them equal privileges as citizens with the Greeks and Macedonians, and allowed them perfect freedom in the practice of their religion. If in the early days of the dispersion, innumerable Jews

were carried away to foreign lands by violence, we know that in later periods many emigrated of their own free will and settled in other countries, for the reason that they found there greater commercial or other advantages than in Palestine, where the imports were more burdensome and life more contracted and anxious. Between the Jews dispersed in the east and those of Palestine a close and heartfelt union was maintained. Jerusalem and the Temple were continually looked up to by the Jews in the eastern countries as the centre of their nationality and religion; from thence they received the teachings of their fathers, and the regulations for the feast days and the calendar; and thither they annually journeyed in hundreds of thousands to offer sacrifices and to worship Jehovah in the Holy Place. It was this regular intercourse between the Jews of the eastern *diaspora* and Jerusalem which, in later years, opened the way by which in the shortest time the Gospel could reach the farthest countries of the Euphrates.

The Jews of other foreign localities also did not give up their connection with Jerusalem, and thus they too became, in later times, the means by which Christianity was disseminated in their own neighbourhoods. Under the Seleucids, especially Seleucus Nicator, great numbers of them had migrated to Syria; and Josephus reports that, comparatively speaking, it was there that the Jews were most numerous.<sup>146</sup> They seem to have been at home in all cities. In Damascus, for example, they numbered thousands, had several synagogues there (Acts ix. 2), and drew over many Gentiles, especially among the women, to their own faith. Under Nero, at the time of an insurrec-



tion, ten thousand of the Jews in Damascus were put to death at once.<sup>147</sup> The Christian religion found an entrance into Damascus very early in its history, as we may see from the life and labours of the Apostle Paul (Acts ix. 1, 2, xxii. 5, etc.). But the Syrian Jews were most numerous in the capital city of Antioch, the principal seat of Hellenistic culture in the east. Here they possessed great privileges, and many of the rights of Roman citizenship, and formed among themselves a separate community with an archon, or ruler, at their head. Their principal synagogue was regarded as very rich and splendid;<sup>148</sup> and many Gentiles were led, through it, to embrace Judaism, among whom was the proselyte Nicholas (Acts vi. 5), who was afterwards converted and ordained a deacon in the Christian church. Through Judaism a door was opened for the Christian religion here also, and very early we find a flourishing Christian church in Antioch. Many of the Christians who were "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen" found a home in Antioch (Acts xi. 19). This was the Antioch where the disciples of Jesus were "first called Christians" (Acts xi. 26; compare I. Peter iv. 16); where Barnabas was a prophet and a teacher, and set out with Paul on their first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 2); where a great number of Greeks were converted (Acts xi. 20, 21); and where the question whether the Christians of non-Jewish descent ought to be circumcised was answered in the negative (Acts xv. 1, 2).

In the cities of Asia Minor also great numbers of Jews resided.<sup>149</sup> Antiochus the great (B.C. 223-187) settled several thousand Jewish families, from Mesopotamia and Babylonia, in Phrygia and Lydia, and granted them many

privileges.<sup>150</sup> Wherever Paul came in his journeys through Asia Minor he found Jewish synagogues (Acts xiii. &c.). It was probably from Asia Minor that the Jews found their way into Greece and other parts of Europe to carry on business there. In all the principal cities which he visited, Paul had free access to the Jewish synagogues, as at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth (Acts xvii. and xviii.). In the islands lying between Asia and Europe, such as Eubœa, Cyprus, and Crete, there was also no small number of Jewish inhabitants.<sup>151</sup> The love of trade which was so strong among the Jews at last led them still further westwards, into Italy, and especially to Rome (Acts xxviii. 17). It is possible that some even found their way into Spain, where they might hope for many advantages and great profits. Many Jews had also been transported to Rome as the prisoners of Pompey, who were afterwards liberated and remained as Roman citizens, dwelling for the most part on the further side of the Tiber (compare Acts vi. 9). In the time of Augustus they must have been very numerous indeed, as when a Jewish deputation, headed by Philo, came to Rome, they found a Jewish community there numbering eight thousand.<sup>152</sup> Under Tiberius an attempt was made (A.D. 19) to banish them;<sup>153</sup> but in the year 40 they had again become numerous, and although Claudius<sup>154</sup> again "commanded all Jews to retire from Rome," when Paul came there (Acts xxviii. 17) he found, in spite of that, a numerous Jewish congregation. In the New Testament the Jews of Rome are called "Libertines" and they had a synagogue at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 9).

The city of Cyrene on the northern coast of Africa was

another Jewish settlement. Ptolemy I.<sup>155</sup> sent Jewish colonists thither, who soon acquired for themselves a position important both in numbers and influence. From thence many Jews came up to the feasts at Jerusalem where they had their own synagogue (Acts ii. 10 and vi. 9), and where many of them were afterwards converted to Christianity, and carried the Gospel back with them to their own country (Acts xi. 20 and xiii. 1). The Simon whom we meet with in the history of Our Lord's passion was a Cyrenian (Matthew xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21), as was also Lucius of Antioch (Acts xiii. 1); and the second book of Maccabees speaks of itself as an abridgment of a great historical work by one Jason of Cyrene (II. Maccabees ii. 23—26). Cyrenian Jews also took part in the insurrections in the times of Trajan and Hadrian.

Many Jews also settled in Nubia and Ethiopia, to the south of Alexandria. Philo says that Jews were found in Egypt from the slopes of the Libyan mountains to the borders of Ethiopia.<sup>156</sup> Probably they had migrated from Arabia, between which country and Egypt there was active commercial intercourse. The Treasurer of Queen Candace, who was a proselyte, was from Ethiopia, and this fact shows that Jews and their allies were to be found there.

But by far the most important and best known of all the foreign cities in which the Jews were dispersed was undoubtedly Alexandria in Egypt. Founded by the great Macedonian, in the year B.C. 332, and after his death ruled by the Ptolemies, it stood for centuries one of the most famous and remarkable cities of the world. While in the valley of the Nile the ancient Egyptian population lived

on, preserving their religion and customs, the cities of the north, more especially Alexandria, had been filled with Greek and Jewish inhabitants. Apart from its wealth, its noble streets, splendid buildings and works of art, Alexandria was celebrated for the stirring intellectual life which was developed in it. Ptolemy I. had founded there the world-famed museum, which contained the Alexandrian library with its numerous and precious volumes, and had also dwellings for scholars, artists, and poets, who came hither from all parts of the world to be present in the seat of the world's literature and art, and the gathering place of the intellectual treasures of Greece and of eastern lands. And to this intellectual life was added the stirring activities of trade and industry, so that the commercial connections of Alexandria extended to Arabia and India, to the peoples inhabiting the deserts on the south and west, and along the coasts of the Mediterranean to Syria and Asia Minor.

Looking at these facts it is easy to understand how it was that Egypt, and especially Alexandria, became the principal Jewish colony. It was Alexander the Great, however, who settled large numbers of Jews in the new capital, and granted them equal civil rights with the Hellenistic colonists, although many Jews had made their homes in Egypt before his time.<sup>157</sup> When after Alexander's death the storms of war gathered over Palestine, thousands of Jews were forcibly removed to Egypt by Ptolemy I.; and many others migrated there of their own accord, attracted by the "goodness of the soil" and the "liberality of Ptolemy."<sup>158</sup> It is calculated that in the time of Jesus the so-called Delta, which formed two of the five divisions

of the city, and was inhabited mostly by Jews, contained a population of a million, although there were Jews living in the other sections also.

The position of the Jews in Egypt was a very favourable one ; they were able to make large gains in trade, handicrafts, and skilled labour, and also to carry on agricultural industries. They formed a separate community among themselves with an ethnarch at their head,<sup>159</sup> with whom, at a later period, was associated a council of elders.<sup>160</sup> Their ancient national organization and customs were preserved ; Jehovah was worshipped in the numerous synagogues, of which the principal one in Alexandria is said to have been magnificent ; and at Leontopolis, in the district of Heliopolis, they were even permitted to erect a Temple of their own.<sup>161</sup> About 160 B.C., Onias, the son of the High Priest, being rejected from the succession to the office, fled from Jerusalem to Alexandria, and was favourably received by Ptolemy VI. (B.C. 180-146). The king gave over to him an almost ruined temple at Leontopolis, which he rebuilt on the model of that at Jerusalem, but on a smaller and more simple scale. It had similar altars for sacrifice and incense, and was furnished with similar vessels. Onias himself was established as the High Priest of it, and the same religious services were performed in it as at Jerusalem, from B.C. 160 to A.D. 72. The Jews in Palestine, especially during the many confusions in their own country, consented to this with certain limitations (compare Isaiah xix 19) ; but demanded, however, the recognition of the Temple at Jerusalem as the religious centre for Judaism in its entirety. The Egyptian Jews

themselves quite coincided with this, and although they willingly made pilgrimages to the temple of Onias, and offered sacrifices there, they regarded it as only a kind of mock-sun, a mere image of the original, and showed great zeal in doing honour as was fitting to the principal Temple of the nation. They felt themselves one people with their brethren in Palestine, and their pride was—although scattered abroad and having their special interests—everywhere and in all points to strictly preserve their nationality. And this was true also of the Jews everywhere else in the great dispersion.

What was the bond of union which held together, not only the Jews of Alexandria, but all those who had been dispersed, as one people with their own distinctive type of nature and character ?

First of all it was, as Schneckenburger shows,<sup>162</sup> the power of an ideal in the mind of the Jewish people which sustained and preserved them wheresoever their lot might be cast. The common faith in a Living God who had led the chosen people hitherto and still watched over them—a God in whom they could place their whole trust for the present and the future—not only inspired the Jews with a sense of superiority to the heathenism by which they were surrounded, and which, with its faith in dead and empty deities, was far below their level, but also preserved them from mixing themselves up with it. Their regard for the Mosaic Law was also a powerful influence in maintaining their distinct nationality and separate existence among foreign peoples. The Law regulated almost every movement of daily life and intercourse, all the conditions and relations of their morals, manners, and



customs, and gave to every expression of their natural life a religious significance ; and thus formed a wall of partition which kept the race from mingling with the impurities of heathenism. Moreover, the fact that this Law was laid down in the Holy Scriptures gave to their religious consciousness a support that was altogether wanting to the heathen religions, which could only be propagated by loose traditions and the public services. The Law and the doctrine were so impressed on the minds of children from their earliest years, by instruction and use, that an intelligent adherence to the God and the religion of their fathers was produced, which seldom permitted a Jew to apostatize from his faith (II. Timothy iii. 15) ; and that which was begun by the teaching of parents and the training of the home, was completed by the congregation in the synagogue. Wherever they dwelt, the Jews were accustomed to assemble themselves, on the Sabbath day at least, in the synagogues, which were their schools of religion, for common prayer and mutual edification in the reading and exposition of the Sacred Books ; or, where they had no special synagogue buildings, they met together in some place where "prayer was wont to be made," the locality chosen for which was, where possible, by a river side. These meetings served especially to keep alive the religious thought and feeling of the people ; and not only so, but they became the centres of Jewish society, the means by which the general life of the community was sustained, and by which also the Jews of the dispersion were closely united among themselves and kept separate from the heathen society around them. Another means by which the Judaism of the dispersion was sustained,

and the scattered communities kept together, was the constant intercourse with Jerusalem, which we have described in a former chapter. Every year rich offerings were sent to the Temple of the One God by chosen messengers ; thither the people went who had business with the High Priest, or the Great Council, in whose hands was the highest spiritual jurisdiction ; from thence the Scribes went forth into all parts of the world, and thither, on the other hand, resorted those among the people who wished to devote themselves to the study of the Law. From Jerusalem the dates for the sacred festivals and other reckonings for the calendar were sent out to the Jewish communities everywhere ; and to go up to Jerusalem annually on the great feast days, or, if he lived too far off for that, to have made a pilgrimage there once or more in his lifetime, was held by every Jew to be an essential part of true religion. Must not this constant organic connection with Jerusalem have been a bond of union for all the Jewish congregations in all parts of the world, and especially for those of Alexandria ?

And yet, in spite of their tenacious adhesion to their nationality, the Alexandrian Jews could not keep themselves entirely free from a certain Hellenistic influence. They lived in the midst of an atmosphere which was full of Greek culture, Greek modes of thought, and Greek forms of speech ; and it was impossible that they should not unconsciously acquire some Greek characteristics. They were constantly brought into contact with Greeks in the ways of business ; the Greek language was the common means of communication and intercourse ; all sorts of Greek ideas circulated, as if spontaneously, among the Jews.

And if we have to speak of the rise of a Jewish literature in the time of Jesus, it must be regarded as an evidence of the truth of what we have just stated. For it was not written in Hebrew, but in Greek, and entered more and more into connection with Hellenism. The ground work of it was formed by the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which had its origin in Alexandria, the Septuagint. The tradition according to which—as Aristeeas writes to his brother Philocrates—the High Priest Eleazar in Jerusalem, in response to a request from king Ptolemy II. (B.C. 283-247), sent seventy-two Scribes to Alexandria, who, in seventy-two days, completed a translation of the Law, is certainly untenable. The probability is that the translation was begun in the time of Ptolemy II.,<sup>163</sup> with a view to the wants of the great Jewish population, and that it went on gradually and was not finished till about B.C. 130. The fact of this translation having been made, becomes in the highest degree important, when we consider that by means of it the religious treasures of the Old Testament were made accessible to the world. The Scriptures, in Greek, were read and understood by the educated; the Jewish religion became known, and thus the way was prepared for Christianity.

Not only so, but, as we have said, the Septuagint was the beginning of a whole literature among the Jews of Alexandria. When the Hebrew had been gradually forgotten among the Israelites of the dispersion, the Greek took its place as the language of daily life and intercourse; but the latter did not always afford the right expression for the oriental idea, and thus the Hellenistic idiom, as it is called, was formed, which renders the

frequent Hebrew thoughts in Greek words, while, on the whole, the character of the work remains Hebraic. The books of the New Testament show this peculiarity as well as the Septuagint and the whole Alexandrian literature, the works of Philo and Josephus at the most being relative exceptions. From their language, the Greek-speaking Jews were called "Hellenists," in contrast with the "Hebrews," who spoke a Hebraic or Aramaic dialect (Acts vi. 1).

In this Hellenistic idiom are written those apocryphal books of the Old Testament which, as regards their contents, are evidently dependent on the Biblical canon, and as regards their style on the Alexandrian translation. Subsequently authorship became more independent, and we hear of Jewish poets, such as the elder Philo and others, of whose writings nothing has come down to us; and of prose-writers who dealt with Jewish history, like Demetrius, Eupolemus, and, especially, Jason of Cyrene, of whose work we have the epitome in the so-called second book of Maccabees. The works entitled the third and fourth books of Maccabees, and the Wisdom of Solomon, as it is termed, belong to a considerably later period.

When the Jewish people of the dispersion had once adopted the Greek language, culture, and literary style, it was inevitable that they should plunge at last into Greek erudition and philosophy. The intellectual treasures of the world of Greek culture became the possessions of the educated Hellenistic Jews, and many amongst them understood Homer and Plato as well as Moses or Solomon. Thus arose the Jewish-Alexandrian religious philosophy, as it is called, whose special object ultimately was to accommo-

date Hebrew theology and Hellenistic philosophy. It began with the conclusion of the Septuagint translation, and was most in vogue at the time of Jesus ; thus, at the epoch when in the east the Jewish national vitality was declining, and the power of the classical spirit had already exhausted itself ; when the decay of the old and the anticipation of something new and greater were both at their height ; when, moreover, a mingling together of opposites in a confused medley of thought was being asserted as the truth by some, and when the hope and expectation of many was being directed to the dawn of new light in the east. Although it may be assumed that there were Jews in other parts of the world who were educated in Greek learning and philosophy, it is certain that the chief seat of that Jewish philosophical activity of which we speak was Alexandria.

Its most general characteristic is the opposition of the Divine and the earthly, of the spirit and the flesh ; a conception of God as the unapproachable, who hides Himself from our cognition : and further, the acceptance of mediating powers between God and the world ; and the contempt of the world of the senses as ungodly, from which the soul must be liberated as from a prison-house. The form in which the Divine discovers itself to the human spirit is that of inspiration, which in the concrete is contained in the Books of Moses and the prophets. The contents of these were received by the Sacred Writers, not only in their spirit and meaning but in the letter, in a holy ecstasy. All wisdom, thought the Alexandrian Jews, is to be found in the Holy Scriptures, especially in the Books of Moses, and indeed all the Hellenic wisdom was, according

to them, only borrowed from the Jewish records, or else contained therein. The literal or verbal sense was certainly not sufficient to prove this, and thus the allegorical method of exposition was adopted, chiefly in application to the Pentateuch. Not the external and obvious sense, but the internal, the deeper sense, they said, is that on which everything depends : the written word is only the verbal form in which a higher meaning is contained ; the letter is there for the great multitude ; the deeper interpretation is for the initiated.

\* A writer named Aristobulus (about B.C. 175) sought to prove in this manner that the Greek poets and philosophers must have been acquainted with the teachings of Moses, and had borrowed their wisdom from an ancient translation of the Pentateuch. But the principal representative of this school is Philo (born about B.C. 20, died at 70 years of age). He was a man of good family, whose brother had been ethnarch of Alexandria, and he is well known to have been the leader of the deputation sent by the Jews to the Emperor Caligula for the maintenance of Jewish interests.<sup>164</sup> His principal work relates to the Pentateuch and especially to the first twelve chapters of Genesis. His method of exposition is the allegorical ; and thus the four rivers of Paradise are to him the four cardinal virtues ; Esau is the type of sensuality ; Abraham, that of the earnest searching mind ; the country in which Abraham was born is the body from which the seeking thought goes out ; the Sabbath rest is the pure peace of the soul ; the hand of God represents His power ; the standing of God signifies the continuance and constancy of the order of the world, etc. When we



look more closely at the substance of his teaching, we find many peculiarities arising from the mixture of Jewish theology and Greek philosophy, especially that of Plato. He reaches the conception of God by the negative of all that is finite. God is pure *Being*, the Jehovah or Jahveh, to whom no special attributes may be ascribed, lest they should limit Him, since He is higher than all. At the same time he regards God as a positive personal existence, and as activity itself. As the fire burns, so God works unceasingly; He cannot be imagined as in a state of repose. The perfect antithesis of God is the world, that is, matter, or the finite; and therefore He, the Holy and the Pure, can hold no direct intercourse with the earth.

Communication between God and the world is established, according to Philo, by certain intermediate beings, who are partly related with the angels of Judaism, partly with the '*ideas*' of Plato. God, the great Abstraction, acts through these, His representatives, His vicegerents, His messengers, and His servants. They form, as it were, an *effulgence* which proceeds from God, like the beams of the sun, and which is reflected back to Him. God created the spiritual world, the world of ideas, first; since they were to be the prototypes of the things to be produced; at the same time they are the powers which encircle God, and are for ever appearing; now as potencies, inseparable from God, and again as independent personal angelic beings.

The concentration and comprehension of these powers, of these ideas, is the "Word" or the "Logos"; he is the true mediator between God and the world, and holds a place on the confines of the finite and the infinite. With Philo he appears as partly impersonal, that is as the

Divine Reason ; partly and more especially as an independent being, proceeding from the nature of the Godhead through the Divine speech. Thus the Logos of Philo is a personification of God, existing in personal distinction from Him, and being His image, representative, and vicegerent, who performs His will and is the instrument by whom He reveals Himself and acts upon the world. The Logos, or Word, thus abides on the one hand in God as the plan of a city remains in the mind of the architect ; and on the other he is as the "seal of God," which impresses on the world of matter the stamp of intelligence. He is not uncreated like God, but also is not created as is the creature. The Logos is the first born Son of God ; the world, the younger son. With God he represents the world as High Priest, Intercessor, Mediator, and Paraclete ; while to the world he represents God, the Inaccessible ; and is the Melchisedec, the Rock in the desert, the Manna, the Messiah. He it is who in the great day of deliverance shall gather the scattered children of Israel together and lead them into the land of peace. We must not forget however that the same Logos who here appears as personal is in other places represented by Philo, in order to avoid polytheism, as the totality of the Divine attributes.

The angels, demons, and souls are to Philo only various names for the same thing. Their number is infinite. A division of them descends from the air to the earth to unite themselves with mortal bodies. Many perish in sensuality : others make earnest endeavours after the higher life. The virtuous among them, after death, go to the heavenly home ; the vicious perish with the destruction of their bodies.

In relation to the nature of man, Philo distinguishes two original types : the transcendental ideal man, who is hermaphrodite and immortal, created in the image of God (compare Genesis i. 26, 27); and an earthly, sensuous, historical man (compare Genesis ii. 7), formed of the dust of the earth. Even the earthly visible man was in the beginning perfect in body and soul, but because he was a created being he could not abide in his perfection ; along with the woman sin entered into the world. And because man is thus constituted of a body, that is, of matter, faulty and incomplete, and of a soul which is Divine, every man finds himself in a constant discord between reason and the animal nature. All sensuousness, however, is reprobate and sinful. Looking at this general sinfulness, the one morality appears to Philo as the extirpation of every lust, every affection and sensuous impulse. But man attains to this virtue not by his own moral deed, but through God's grace, which can only be appropriated by faith, and which alone makes a man pious and righteous. In this morality Philo assumes three stages : the practice of virtue in temperance and self-denial ; the instruction or teaching ; and the God-given wisdom. As, however, God is not perceptible, man can only attain to the knowledge of God and be wrapt into His joy in a miraculous manner, that is, through ecstasy.

In the Messianic period, the expectation of which Philo founds upon the Pentateuch (Leviticus xxvi. ; Numbers xxiv. 7 ; Deuteronomy xxviii. ; *ib.* xxx. 11-14), the Jews will, according to him, enter into the land destined for them ; the golden age will dawn ; the earth will be fruitful, and mankind pious and happy ; and the chosen

people will at last draw all the other nations to themselves.

Among all the men of his time, the Therapeutæ, a Jewish community widely spread in Egypt, were such as Philo would have them be (that is if we may take the work which is our only source of information about them, "*De vita contemplativa*," as really coming from him),<sup>165</sup> because they abstained as much as possible from all contact with what was material and earthly, and devoted themselves to the meditative life. Their name signifies, according to Philo, 'soul-healers,' and thus pure worshippers of God. Their principal seat was on an eminence near Alexandria. Their chief occupation was the cultivation of the ascetic life, and of a mystical absorption in the Divine. Their main endeavour was to evince the utmost abstemiousness. Their labour was limited to that which was absolutely necessary for the maintenance of life.

The influence of Philo's views on Christianity was certainly not direct. The Apostles have, as regards the substance of their writings, derived nothing from Philo; although particular expressions and designations may have been derived from the speech of the Alexandrian philosophy; such as: "The Word" (the "*Logos*," John i. 1); "The Fulness of the Godhead" (Colossians ii. 9); "The Image of the Invisible God" (Colossians i. 15); and—"The Brightness of His Glory, the express Image of His Person" (Hebrews i. 3). But the essential element of the Christian doctrine is absolutely another thing. No trace can be found with Philo of the New Testament doctrine of redemption and reconciliation. The *Logos* of Philo had a Hellenistic-philosophical significance; that of

the New Testament bears quite a different character. We may however regard the work of Philo as denoting an inclination of men's minds towards Judaism and its religion, towards the fulness of Divine revelation resting therein, and towards the expected Messiah and Saviour.

The city of Alexandria became famous and important through Philo and the Alexandrian philosophy, but also through the life and activity of the Jewish community in general in the Egyptian capital. They helped to preserve, for Mosaism, the esteem in which it was held, and to make the Gentiles around them acquainted with it. As, however, the Old Testament is a great introduction to the New, so the activity of the Alexandrian Jews did but prepare the way for the Christian religion, of which the city itself afterwards became one of the most famous seats. But the sun of prosperity was not to shine always on the Jewish community in Egypt. Under the emperor Caligula they began to be oppressed, and when, in the reign of Vespasian, the Egyptian Jews took part in the insurrection against Rome, the celebrated colony came to an end. The Jewish inhabitants were slain or banished, and even the Temple of Onias was closed in the year 72 A.D.

If we now take a general view of the condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire, it must be acknowledged that in the beginning they had not much to complain of under the ascendancy of the Pagans. It was, indeed, an old principle of Roman law, that at Rome only Roman deities should be worshipped ; but as the Empire grew, and the privilege of Roman citizenship was more generally distributed, the strict maintenance of the religio-civil order

of ancient Rome became ever more difficult ; and soon the free practice of their religion was granted to the Jews at Rome, and thus their spread was promoted.<sup>166</sup> While the Jews of the further east, and those of Egypt, showed themselves brave warriors, those in Greece, Asia Minor, and Syria sought, on religious grounds, for freedom from military service, and obtained it ; the Roman government, in the time of Julius Cæsar and Octavius, plainly attached more importance to their weighty contributions to the State treasury than to their military services. Many other favours were also granted to the Jews ; the transmission of the offerings and dues to the Temple was permitted ; they could not be summoned before the tribunals on a Sabbath day ; they received their share in the distribution of public stores ; and if it took place on a Sabbath day, their portion was delivered to them on some other day.

Nevertheless, the Jews were not everywhere liked by the Gentiles. Many of the latter, it is true, were filled with admiration and sympathy for Judaism, with its spiritual worship of one God, the unity and mutual helpfulness of its adherents among themselves, and its moral earnestness. On the other hand the Jews were often scoffed at for their singularities. The sign of their covenant, circumcision, was laughed to scorn ; their abstinence from swine's flesh, their strict Sabbatarianism, their religion without images and pictures, was regarded as a barbarous superstition ; and their customs were called absurd and mean.<sup>167</sup> On account of their refusal to participate in heathen pleasures, such as those of the table or the theatre, they were reproached with misanthropy and contempt of the world, and stigmatized as a dismal and detestable people.



Thus it is easy to understand the behaviour towards Judaism of a series of heathen writers, of whom only the names of a Hecataeus of Abdera, a Manetho, an Apollonius Molo of Rhodes, a Cicero, and an Apion need be mentioned. One of Cicero's orations, which are yet preserved, was delivered in defence of Flaccus, who was well known as an enemy of the Jews; and Apion accused the Jews of various laughable absurdities on the one hand, and much that was execrable on the other, and by his words did a great deal to nourish hatred and scorn against them on the part of the Gentiles. In opposition to him, Josephus defended them with great energy in his apologetic work "*Contra Apion*;" and Philo also in most of his writings pleads their cause against the heathen, laying stress especially on the spirit of goodness in the Mosaic Law, and bringing out the morality and genuineness of the Pentateuch.

If, however, the Jews were offensive to the heathens, the latter were not less so to the Jews, on account of their idols and their idolatrous reverence of the emperor, their superstition, and their immoral practices. The Jews consciously exhibited the superiority of their religion in contrast with heathenism; indeed the more earnest and zealous among them became preachers of repentance among the Gentiles, exhorting them to a change of life and a purer faith. And many souls, conscious of religious needs, and longing for truth, moral power, peace of conscience, and for some disclosure of destiny on the other side of the grave, became, in spite of many difficulties, proselytes to Judaism. Unmistakably it was the great mission of the Israelitish people to proclaim to

the world the true faith in God, and to draw men to it. The principal centres of Jewish population in the great dispersion were mission stations for monotheism, and served at the same time to prepare the way for Christianity.

The godly Jews, especially those of the time of Cæsar and Augustus, believed it to be well pleasing to God, out of zeal for the Law to win over Gentiles to their religious fellowship. It is said of the Scribes that they "compassed sea and land to make one proselyte" (Matthew xxiii. 15); and Josephus,<sup>168</sup> Horace,<sup>169</sup> Seneca,<sup>170</sup> and others testify to the zeal of the Jews in making conversions in the Roman Empire. Women especially readily turned to Judaism (Acts xiii 50, xvii. 4),<sup>171</sup> but many men also were converted, some of whom were of high rank, such as the chamberlain of queen Candace (Acts viii. 27), and king Izates of Adiabene, with his entire family.<sup>172</sup>

Gentiles thus won over to Judaism were called Proselytes (Matthew xxiii. 15). The majority of them were attached to the Jewish communities of the dispersion; the extent of the propaganda in Palestine must therefore have been more limited, although the Jewish element there greatly preponderated. Here it must be pointed out that the old distinction between 'Proselytes of the Gate' and 'Proselytes of Righteousness,' according to which the former were Gentiles converted to Judaism, who did not observe all the obligations of the Law, and who especially did not submit to circumcision, and the latter were those who had entered into full communion with the Jewish fellowship and had fulfilled all righteousness, cannot be regarded as appropriate.<sup>173</sup> For the 'Proselytes of the Gate' (novices, strangers; Hebrew, *gerim haschaar*) were

only those "foreigners who dwelt within the gates of Israel without having come over to the religion of Israel" (Exodus xx. 10; Deuteronomy xiv. 21). The conditions required of them were principally the observance of the so-called seven precepts of Noah; that they should avoid blasphemy, idolatry, murder, incest, pillage, rebellion, and partaking of blood (compare Leviticus iii. 17, Acts xv. 20 etc.).

This regulation however had in the days of Jesus but little practical importance, for the Greeks and Romans, living in Palestine under Roman protection, seldom or never were entirely bound by it. But as the 'Proselytes of the Gate' cannot be strictly considered as belonging to Judaism, it follows that the "religious proselytes," or "devout persons" (Acts xiii. 43 and 50; xvii. 4 and 17; xviii. 7), must not be confounded with them, since these latter, although in a general sense they were called "proselytes" or "devout allies of the Jews" (Matthew xxiii. 15; Acts xiii. 43), had actually made profession of the faith of Israel.

When such Gentile converts wished to enter into fellowship with the Jews three things above all were demanded of them—if they were men—circumcision, baptism, and the offering of a sacrifice; if they were women, of course the two last only were required. Circumcision and sacrifice need no explanation; but by baptism must be understood the complete immersion of the converts, the object of which was the symbolical purification of those who had come out of a heathenism, which was held to be entirely unclean. If, especially in the time of Jesus, the Jews themselves who were zealous for the Law were bound by

its standing rules frequently to immerse themselves in water as a symbol of purification, it appeared above all things necessary for one who had been born a heathen, that he should, at his entrance into Judaism, submit to a similar symbolical bathing.

Of those who had been thus baptised and admitted into the Hebrew church, or "Proselytes of Righteousness" as they were called, the complete fulfilment of the Mosaic Law was in principle demanded, and everyone so received laid himself under an obligation to keep the whole Law. In practice however, the case was different, and it is scarcely conceivable that the full rigour of Pharisaic observance of the Law could be carried out in the dispersion. Rather, people held to the cardinal points, and satisfied themselves with what was attainable; and Josephus seems to point to that conclusion when he boasts that "in almost all places and among all peoples Jewish worship of God was to be found; and that fasting, Sabbath observance, the lighting of candles, and many of the laws about eating and drinking, were observed."<sup>174</sup> It is quite in accordance with probability to think that among the thousands of Proselytes not every minute observance of the rules was punctiliously fulfilled, but that some kept the precepts more, and others less strictly.

Some of the Proselytes were perhaps attracted by the advantage of living among the quiet substantial Jews, or by the immunity from military service; others were moved by curiosity and the love of change and novelty to join themselves to Judaism; but most were certainly led by their consciousness of the errors and defects of heathen worship, by the longing for rest in their souls which

thirsted for the true God, and the want of a firm moral support for their lives, to seek fellowship in the Mosaic religion. They said to themselves that therein they should find, through the belief in one living and everywhere present God, a peace and satisfaction which had never come to them in the worship of gods made by themselves in their own image (Romans i. 23); there, in mind and soul, they would be able to rise above the level of commonplace and sinful life; there they could find the precepts of a true morality, which was wanting in heathenism; there, too, they would be consoled and comforted with the hope of the help and blessing of God at all times and in all places.

The same influences which in this way led Proselytes to Judaism also prepared the heathen world for the reception of Christianity. The "fulness of the time" was near. In the sphere of religion people hoped for help and healing neither from Roman politics nor from Greek wisdom. Judaism in the great dispersion had fulfilled its mission in directing man's gaze to the east, where the Light of the World appeared in Him who is the fulfilment of the Law, of the great promises of God, and the highest hopes of men.

## APPENDIX.

### I.

#### NOTES.

- 1 Tacitus (*Annals* xv. 44) writing of the time of Nero, speaks of the hated people who were called Christians, and who were persecuted by the emperor. He calls Christianity a "pernicious superstition," and says that "the author of this name was Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius was brought to punishment by Pontius Pilate the procurator."
- 2 Suetonius (*Claudius*, c. 25) says of the emperor Claudius : "He banished the Jews from Rome, who at the instigation of "Chrestus" were always raising tumults." There is no doubt that in this passage "Chrestus" stands for "Christus," and that Suetonius refers not to the personal presence of Christ in Rome but to a supposed seditious tendency among his followers, imparted by him.
- 3 Pliny the Younger (*Epistle* x. 97), as proconsul of Bithynia and Pontus, writing to Trajan, asks for directions as to how he shall proceed against the Christians, and says : "I discovered no more than that they were addicted to an odious and extravagant superstition." He further says that "they called themselves Christians, and were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light to sing a hymn to Christ as to a god ; and to bind themselves by a sacrament (or oath) not to do anything that was evil."

Other Pagan writers also refer to the Christian religion, such as Celsus, Porphyry, Lucian, Hierocles, and others.

- 4 Philo was born about B.C. 20. There were two occasions on which he might have spoken of Jesus : in his description of Essenism, and when writing of the character of Pontius Pilate.



- 5 Josephus was born A.D. 37.
- 6 This famous passage (Antiquities XVIII. iii. 3) reads as follows : "About this time lived Jesus, a wise man [if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was] a doer of wonderful works [and a teacher of those who received the truth with pleasure]. He drew over to his side many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. [This was the Christ] whom Pilate, upon the accusation of the principal men among us, condemned to the cross, when however those that loved him at the first did not forsake him. [For he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the Divine prophets had foretold, along with ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him]. The party of the Christians, so called after him, are not extinct at this day."

Notwithstanding all that has been said for and against the authenticity of this passage, there is little doubt that the basis of it, at least, is the genuine writing of Josephus ; although it is true that it cannot be regarded word for word as coming from him, since only a Christian could have written in such terms. The passage may well have been revised by a Christian hand, and the parts bracketed inserted for the sake of completeness. The, at least relative, genuineness of it is confirmed by another passage from Josephus (Antiquities XX. ix. 1) where he speaks of Christ as a person well-known to his readers.

- 7 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. iii. 3.
- 8 Compare Schuerer in his "History of New Testament Times," page 262 ; and Riehm, Bible Dictionary, under "Cyrenius." In order to solve the difficulty many would translate Luke ii. 2 : "And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria" as "This taxing took place *before* (prote) Quirinus (Cyrenius) was governor of Syria." Others take the word rendered "was made" (*egeneto*) as meaning "took effect" or "was carried out ;" so that the decree for the 'taxing' was issued at the time when Jesus was born, but it was not actually made until Cyrenius was governor. Others

again think that *egeneto* is equivalent to “was completed.” For reasons against these readings, see the authors cited. If a ‘taxing’ when Jesus was born, that is in the latter part of Herod’s time, was intended, it could not, according to Schuerer’s exhaustive treatment of the subject, have been a general Roman one under Cyrenius, but a local one; and thus the probability would be that St. Luke was in error in speaking of the general ‘taxing’ as having taken place in the time of Herod.

[One or two additional notes seem to me to be required here. The difficulty is briefly this: that history knows nothing—apart from St. Luke—of any such general taxing or census at the time when Jesus was born; and that there is evidence that an enrolment was carried out about A.D. 6, when Cyrenius was governor in Syria. But (1) *Argumenta e silentio* are not regarded as of much importance by those who are competent to judge of such questions. The accuracy of any ancient writer might be impugned on such grounds with regard to almost every statement he makes. (2) Where St. Luke is contradicted by other writers, it is but fair to remember that he is generally regarded as an accurate and careful historian; and in some instances, similar to that referred to above, deeper research has shown him to be right, and his critics wrong. (3) The supposition that Luke only meant that the taxing, or census, was completed at the time when Cyrenius was governor is part of a learned argument by Zumpt, in his “*Geburtsjahr Christi*.” His theory is, that Cyrenius was governor of Syria at two different periods; and that the census which had been ordered by his predecessor Varus was *begun* by him in the first period, about B.C. 4, and *completed* in the second, A.D. 6. His arguments are epitomized in Canon Farrar’s notes on Luke ii. 1 in the “Cambridge Bible for Schools,” and in his “Life of Christ,” with some able remarks showing their extreme probability.—Tr.]

- 10 Compare Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis, page 67 ; and Winer, Biblical Dictionary, under "Jesus" and "Star of the Magi."
- 11 See Wieseler as above
- 12 Josephus, Antiquities, XVII. vi. 4.
- 13 Josephus, Antiquities, XVII. ix. 3 ; Wars of the Jews, II. i. 3.
- 14 Suetonius, Tiberius, XXI.
- 15 Josephus, Antiquities, XV. xi. 1.
- 16 Compare Luke i. 5.
- 17 I. Chronicles xxiv. 10.
- 18 Mishna Taanith, IV. 6. Josephus (Wars VI. iv. 5) gives the 10th of Ab as the date of the burning of the Temple. Compare Schuerer, "History of New Testament Times," page 345.
- 19 From the saying of the Jews in John viii. 57 : "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" to assume that Jesus was then about forty-nine years old, and from that to infer the date of his birth and the length of his life, would not be safe reasoning.
- 20 Schneckenburger, "History of New Testament Times," page 12.
- 21 In his "*Panathenaikos*," page 294.
- 22 Natural History.
- 23 For this reason Baal sometimes appears as feminine, as in Hosea ii. 6-8, Zephaniah i. 4. Compare Riehm, Bible Dictionary, under "Astarte."
- 24 Suetonius, Vespasian, XXIII.
- 25 Epistles, I. 18.
- 26 Epistles, XXXI. and XLI.
- 27 *De Ira*, III. 15.
- 28 *De Ira*.
- 29 *De Ira*.
- 30 Vespasian, IV.
- 31 History, V. 13.
- 32 Eclogue IV. Schuerer ("History of New Testament Times,"

page 576), is quite of the opinion that Virgil and Tacitus got the idea, directly or indirectly, from Josephus (Wars VI. v. 4).

- 33 Satire XIII. 26.
- 34 Ode III. 6.
- 35 *De Ira*, II. 8.
- 36 History, introduction.
- 37 Juvenal, Satire VI. 226.
- 38 Natural History.
- 39 Ode III. 6.
- 40 *Germania*, c. 19.
- 41 *De Beneficiis*, I. ix.
- 42 Compare Tacitus, Annals, II. 85.
- 43 Apology, XV.
- 44 *De Beneficiis*, VII. 10.
- 45 *Trinummus*, II. 2.
- 46 Josephus, Wars, III. iii. 2. Tacitus, History, V. 6. Compare Matthew xiii. 23.
- 47 Compare Josephus, Wars, III. iii. 2.
- 48 Compare pages 56, 62.
- 49 Ezra i. 5, x. 9; Nehemiah xi. 4. Compare Josephus, Antiquities, XI. v. 2.
- 50 Ezra vi. 21. Compare Schuerer, page 372.
- 51 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. iii. 1.
- 52 Compare page 75.
- 53 Josephus, Antiquities, XV. xi. Wars, V. v.
- 54 Compare Winer, "Richthaus."
- 55 Josephus, Wars, VI. ix. iii. II xiv. 3.
- 56 Josephus, Antiquities, XI. viii. 4.
- 57 Josephus, Antiquities, XX. vi. 1.
- 58 Josephus, Wars, III. iii. 2.
- 59 Josephus, ib.
- 60 The surname Maccabeus, plural Maccabi, signifies "hammer," and may have been a name of honour given to Judas, after whom the family were called the "Maccabees." Less probable is the supposition that the name was formed from

the initial letters of the motto inscribed on their standard :  
 “Mi Kamoka Baelim Jehovah,” that is, “Who is like unto  
 Thee among the gods, O Lord ?” (Exodus xv. 11).

- 61 Pompey carried other Jews to Rome with him besides Aristobulus, and these formed the nucleus of the Jewish community in Rome
- 62 Compare page 57.
- 63 The statement in Matthew ii. 22, only signifies that Archelaus ruled as ethnarch.
- 64 Compare Josephus, Antiquities, XVII. xi. 4.
- 65 Josephus, Wars, II. viii. 1.
- 66 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. iii. 1.
- 67 Compare pages 57, 58.
- 68 Compare Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. ii. 2.
- 69 Compare pages 6, 134.
- 70 Compare Luke vi. 15 ; Acts i. 13. ; and page 134.
- 71 Josephus, Wars, IV. iii. 9.
- 72 *Leg. ad Caium*, XXXVIII.
- 73 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. iii. 1.
- 74 Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, XXXVIII.
- 75 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. iv. ii.
- 76 Son of Herod the Great and the second Mariamne.
- 77 Herod Philip the Tetrarch was thus son-in-law to Herodias.
- 78 Josephus, Antiquities, XIV. xv. 10.
- 79 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. v. 1. Compare II. Corinthians xi. 32.
- 80 Compare page 23.
- 81 Josephus, Wars, VI. iv. 5.
- 82 Wars, II. xx. 5.
- 83 Josephus, Life, 12 ; Antiquities, XII. iii. 3.
- 84 Josephus, Antiquities, XIV. ix. 4.
- 85 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. i. 4.
- 86 Josephus, Antiquities, XX. x. ; IV. viii. 14.
- 87 Compare Schuerer, page 411.
- 88 Compare Schuerer, page 416.
- 89 Schuerer, page 414.

- 90 Compare Schuerer, page 415.
- 91 Winer, under "Synedrium."
- 92 Schuerer, pages 420, 421.
- 93 See the list given by Schuerer, page 418.
- 94 *Contra Apion*, I. 7, 8. In this enumeration he includes Ruth with Judges as one book, Lamentations with Jeremiah, and Ezra with Nehemiah. He also counts the twelve minor prophets as one book. So Hieronymus, *Praef. Reg.*; and Origen, see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* VI. 25.
- 95 Compare Winer, under "Rabbi":—"Major est Rabbi quam Rab, et major est Rabban quam Rabbi."
- 96 Compare Delitzsch, "Artizan Life," page 75.
- 97 Delitzsch, "Jesus and Hillel," page 11.
- 98 Schuerer, page 460.
- 99 Delitzsch, "Jesus and Hillel."
- 100 Winer, under "Temple."
- 101 Compare page 96.
- 102 On the first day of the week the proper psalm was the 24th, on the second the 48th, on the third the 82nd, on the fourth the 94th, on the fifth the 81st, on the sixth the 93rd, and on the Sabbath 92nd.
- 103 This was probably the origin of the systematic reading of the Scriptures in Christian churches.
- 104 *Contra Apion*, I. 12.
- 105 Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*.
- 106 Gfroerer, "The Century of Salvation," I. 87.
- 107 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIII. x. 5, 6.
- 108 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. ii. 4.
- 109 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. i. 4.
- 110 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. i. 3 and XIII. v. 9.
- 111 Josephus, *Wars*, II. viii. 14.
- 112 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIII. x. 6.
- 113 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. ii. 4.
- 114 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. i. 4.
- 115 Compare page 84.
- 116 Compare Winer, under "Zadok."



- 117 Josephus, Antiquities, XX. ix. 1 ; compare Acts v. 17.
- 118 Josephus, Antiquities, XIII. x. 6 and XVIII. i. 4.
- 119 Schneckenburger, page 144.
- 120 Josephus, *Contra Apion*, I. 8, and Antiquities, XIII x. 6.]
- 121 Josephus, *ib.*
- 122 Josephus, Wars, II. viii. 14.
- 123 So called by Josephus, Antiquities, XIII. v. 9, XVIII. i. 5.
- 124 So called by Philo, *Quod omnis prob. lib.*
- 125 Josephus, Antiquities, XIII. v. 9.
- 126 Josephus, Antiquities, XIII. xi. 2.
- 127 Philo, *De vita contemplativa.*
- 128 Compare Zeller, Theological Yearbook, 1856 ; and Schuerer, "History of New Testament Times," page 601, *et seq.*
- 129 Lucius, "Therapeutæ and their place in the history of asceticism," 1879. Compare Journal of Theological Literature, No. 5, 1880.
- 130 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. i. 5.
- 131 Pliny, Natural History, V. 17.
- 132 "History of Jesus," page 83.
- 133 Josephus, Antiquities, X. x. and xi.
- 134 Schuerer, page 479.
- 135 *De execrationibus*, and *De præmiis et poenis.*
- 136 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. iii. 3.
- 137 Josephus, Wars, VI. v. 4.
- 138 *Ib.*
- 139 History, V. 13.
- 140 Vespasian, IV.
- 141 Eclogue IV. Compare page 31.
- 142 Josephus, Antiquities, XIV. vii. 2.
- 143 *Leg. ad Caium*, XXXI.
- 144 Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. ix. 1
- 145 Josephus, Antiquities, XX. ii. 3.
- 146 Josephus, Wars, VII. iii. 3.
- 147 Josephus, Wars, II. xx. 2.
- 148 Josephus, Wars, VII. iii. 3.

- 149 Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, XXXI.
- 150 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. iii. 4.
- 151 Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, XXXVI.
- 152 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. xi. 1.
- 153 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. iii. 5.
- 154 Suetonius, *Claudius*, XXV.
- 155 Josephus, *Contra Apion*, II. 4.
- 156 *Contra Flaccum*, VI.
- 157 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIX. v. 2.
- 158 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. i.
- 159 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIV. vii. 2.
- 160 Philo, *Contra Flaccum*, X.
- 161 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. ix. 7. XIII. iii. 3.
- 162 "History of New Testament Times," page 99.
- 163 Philo, *Vita Mosis*, II. 5, 6. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. ii. 1.
- 164 Cicero, *Pro Flacco*.; Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, XLIV.
- 165 Compare page 142.
- 166 Compare page 24.
- 167 Tacitus, *History*, V. 5.
- 168 *Contra Apion*, II. 29.
- 169 Horace, *Sat.* I. 4.
- 170 See Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, VI. 11
- 171 Josephus, *Wars*, II. xx. 2.
- 172 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX. ii. 3.
- 173 Compare article on Proselytes by Schuerer in Riehm's Bible Dictionary.
- 174 *Contra Apion*, II. 40.

## II.

### CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

B. C.

- 323. Death of Alexander the Great.
- 323. Conquest of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I. A colony of Jews removed into Egypt.
- 320—203. Rule of the Ptolemies over Palestine.
- 280. Commencement of the Alexandrian translation (LXX) under Ptolemy II.
- 203. Antiochus III. (the Great), king of Syria from 223 to 187, takes possession of Palestine.
- 187. Death of Antiochus III.
- 187—175. Seleucus IV. (Philopator), king of Syria.
- 175—164. Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes), king of Syria.
- 167. Rebellion of the Jews under the Maccabees (Asmoneans) against the Syrians.
- 166. Death of Mattathias Maccabeus.
- 160. Death of Judas Maccabeus. Onias in Egypt. The temple at Leontopolis built.
- 160—143. Jonathan Maccabeus.
- 143—135. Simon Maccabeus.
- 140. The last-named becomes hereditary High Priest and Prince of Palestine.
- 135—105. John Hyrcanus I.
- 129. Destruction of the temple on Mount Gerizim by John Hyrcanus.
- 105—104. Aristobulus I.
- 104—78. Alexander Jannæus.
- 78—69. Alexandra, queen. Pharisaism in its prime.
- 69—63. Aristobulus II. Fratricidal war between him and Hyrcanus II.

B.C.

- 63. Pompey comes to Jerusalem. Aristobulus taken prisoner.
- 63—40. Hyrcanus II., High Priest and Prince, without the title of king. Rise of the Idumean Antipater and his sons Phasael and Herod.
- 61. Pompey's triumphant return to Rome with Aristobulus and other Jews as prisoners. Beginning of a Jewish colony in Rome.
- 59. Cicero's oration against the Jews (*Pro Flacco*).
- 49. Aristobulus II. died. War between Pompey and Cæsar.
- 48. Battle of Pharsalia. Cæsar victorious. Hyrcanus and Antipater take Cæsar's side.
- 47. Antipater made by Cæsar procurator of Judæa; Hyrcanus, High Priest and ethnarch of the Jews. Phasael made governor of Judæa, and Herod governor of Galilee.
- 44. Cæsar died (March 15th).
- 43. Cassius in Syria. Death of Antipater.
- 42. Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, endeavours to obtain the rule over Palestine. Battle at Philippi. Antonius becomes ruler over Asia; Phasael and Herod made by him tetrarchs of Judæa.
- 40. The Parthians invade Palestine. Death of Phasael. Hyrcanus taken prisoner by the Parthians.
- 40—37. Antigonus, made by the Parthians king of Palestine.
- 40. Herod, in Rome, appointed king.
- 39. Herod returns to Palestine to fight with Antigonus.
- 37. Herod takes possession of Jerusalem.
- 37—4. Herod the Great, actual king of Palestine.
- 37. Herod marries Mariamne, the granddaughter of Hyrcanus. Antigonus put to death.
- 36. Hyrcanus returns from the Parthians to Jerusalem.
- 35. Aristobulus III., the High Priest, brother of Mariamne, killed by Herod.
- 34. Joseph, Herod's uncle, killed by him. Cleopatra obtains the greater part of Phenicia and the district of Jericho from Antony. Cleopatra in Jerusalem.
- 32—31. War between the Arabians and Jews.

## B.C.

31. Battle at Actium. Octavianus Augustus becomes emperor.
30. Hyrcanus II. put to death.
30. Herod is installed as king of Palestine by Augustus, in Rhodes. Later on he receives back Jericho, with the addition of Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Strato's Tower (Cæsarea).
29. Death of Mariamne, and of her mother, Alexandra, soon afterwards.
25. Death of Costobarus and the sons of Babas. The newly-built city of Samaria is called Sebaste. Famine.
24. Herod marries the second Mariamne. He obtains from Augustus the territories of Trachonitis, Batanæa, and Auranitis, to complete his kingdom.
20. Herod receives from Augustus the Syrian province as a present. Commencement of the building of the Temple in Jerusalem.
15. Agrippa, son-in-law of Octavianus Augustus, in Jerusalem.
10. Cæsarea (Strato's Tower) inaugurated.
7. Death of Alexander and Aristobulus, sons of Herod and the first Mariamne.
5. Pheroras, Herod's brother, died.
4. Rebellion. Christ born. Death of Antipater; and, five days later, of Herod.
- 4—A.D. 6. Archelaus, ethnarch over Judæa, Samaria, and Idumea; after his banishment, these provinces governed by Roman procurators till A.D. 41, when they are added to the kingdom of Agrippa I.
- 4—A.D. 34. Philip, tetrarch of Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis; at his death these territories are annexed to the Roman province of Syria, until they too are placed under Agrippa I.
- 4—A.D. 39. Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa; after his banishment, Agrippa obtains these provinces also.

## A.D.

6. Archelaus banished to Vienna in Gallia; his dominions annexed to Syria, and governed by procurators.

## A.D.

- 6—9 (about). Coponius, first procurator.
- 9—12 (about). Marcus Ambivius, second procurator.
- 12—15 (about). Annius Rufus, third procurator.
- 14. Death of Octavius Augustus.
- 14—37. Tiberius, Roman emperor..
- 15—26. Valerius Gratus, fourth procurator.
- 26—36. Pontius Pilate, fifth procurator.
- 34. Death of Herod Philip.
- 34—37. The former tetrarchy of Philip under direct Roman Government.
- 36—37. Marcellus, sixth procurator.
- 37—41. Marullus, seventh procurator.
- 37—41. Caligula, Roman emperor.
- 37. Agrippa I. (son of the Aristobulus who had been killed B.C. 7) obtains from Caligula [the former tetrarchy of Philip with the title of king.
- 39. Herod Antipas banished to Lugdunum in Gallia. Agrippa I. obtains his tetrarchy likewise from Caligula.
- 41—54. Claudius, Roman emperor.
- 41. Agrippa I. receives from Claudius the territory formerly under Archelaus; and also Abila on Lebanon; so that from A.D. 41 to 44 all the former dominions of Herod the Great are again united under his rule.
- 41—48.\* Herod (brother of Agrippa I.) ruler of Chalcis.
- 44. Death of Agrippa I. His whole territory is again ruled by Roman procurators under the governor of Syria.
- 44—46. Rule of the Roman procurators.
- 44. Insurrectionary movements break out; probably that of Theudas.
- 50—100. Agrippa II. (son of Agrippa I.), receives Chalcis, and later on the tetrarchy of Philip, Abila, and a few districts in Galilee and Peræa.
- 52—60. Felix, procurator (husband of Drusilla). Paul taken prisoner. Disorder and rebellion increase.
- 54—68. Nero, Roman emperor.
- 60—62. Porcius Festus, procurator. Paul, as a Roman citizen, sent to Rome.



A.D.

- 62. James, the Lord's brother, put to death.
- 64. Great fire in Rome.
- 64—66. Gessius Florus, the last procurator.
- 66—73. The great war of the Jews against Rome.
- 68—69. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, Roman emperors.
- 69—79. Vespasian, Roman emperor.
- 70. Titus receives the command in Palestine. Destruction of Jerusalem. The Temple set on fire, on the tenth of the month Ab.
- 73. The temple of Onias at Leontopolis closed.
- 98—117. Trajan, Roman emperor.
- 115—117. Rebellion of the Jews against Trajan in Cyrene, Egypt, Cyprus and Mesopotamia ; but probably not in Palestine.
- 117—138. Hadrian, Roman emperor.
- 132—135. Rebellion of the Jews against Hadrian in Palestine. Jerusalem is made a heathen city, with the name *Ælia Capitolina*. The Jews are forbidden to enter it.  
Under Antonius Pius (A.D. 138—161) circumcision is again permitted among the Jews ; and in the fourth century they are again allowed to enter Jerusalem.

# INDEX.

---

	PAGE
Abia, course of ... ..	8
Actium, battle of ... ..	11
Adiabene, Jews in ... ..	164
Æsculanus ... ..	21
Age of Our Lord ... ..	9
Agni... ..	18
Agrippa I.... ..	85, 86
Agrippa II. ... ..	86
Ahriman ... ..	18
Alexander the Great ... ..	10, 68, 168
Alexander Jannæus ... ..	69
Alexander, son of Herod the Great ... ..	77
Alexander, son of Aristobulus II. ... ..	70
Alexandra ... ..	70
Alexandra, mother-in-law of Herod the Great ... ..	72
Alexandria, Jews in ... ..	169
————— museum and library in ... ..	169
————— commerce of ... ..	169
Amphitheatre at Rome ... ..	46
————— near Jerusalem ... ..	74
Ananeel, the High Priest ... ..	72
Ananias, the High Priest ... ..	97
Anna, the prophetess ... ..	159
Annas, the High Priest ... ..	96
Annius Rufus, procurator ... ..	80
Antigonus, son of Aristobulus II. ... ..	70, 71
Antioch, Jews in, and flourishing synagogues ... ..	166
Antiochus the Great ... ..	68

	PAGE
Antiochus Epiphanes ... ..	68
Antipater, father of Herod the Great ... ..	70
Antipater, son of Herod the Great ... ..	77, 78
Antonius, Marcus ... ..	71, 73
Antonius Felix, procurator ... ..	86
Antonius Pius ... ..	90
Apion, enemy of the Jews .. ...	184
Apocalyptic Books ... ..	149, 151
Apocrypha ... ..	99, 150
Apollo ... ..	20
Arabia, Jews in ... ..	164
Aramaic dialect ... ..	53
Archelaus ... ..	79, 80
Aretas, king of Arabia ... ..	84, 85
Aristobulus I. ... ..	69
Aristobulus II. ... ..	70
Aristobulus III., the High Priest ... ..	72
Aristobulus, son of Herod the Great ... ..	77
Art, degradation of, by the Gentiles ... ..	36
Artizan Life in Jerusalem ... ..	59
Ascension of Moses, book of ... ..	154
Aschera ... ..	19
Asia, Jews in ... ..	166
Asmoneans .. ...	69
Assyria, Jews in ... ..	164
Astarte ... ..	19
Augustus, Emperor ... ..	10, 73
Auranitis, province of ... ..	67, 82, 83
Baal ... ..	19
Babas ... ..	73
Babylon, Jews in ... ..	164
Babylonians, religion of ... ..	19
Banquets, Roman... ..	36
Bar-cochba ... ..	89
Baruch ... ..	156

	PAGE
Batanæa ... ..	67, 82, 83
Bethany ... ..	59
Bethlehem ... ..	59
Bethphage ... ..	59
Brahma ... ..	18
“Bread and Play” ... ..	45
 Cæsar, Julius, murder of... ..	71
——— favours Antipater ... ..	70
Cæsarea ... ..	74
Cæsarea Philippi ... ..	82
Caiaphas, the High Priest ... ..	98
Candace, Queen, her Treasurer a proselyte ... ..	168
Canon, division of Jewish ... ..	98, 99
Casuistry of the Scribes ... ..	105
Census under Cyrenius (see Note 8) ... ..	6, 81
Cestius Gallus ... ..	87
Children, treatment of, among the Gentiles ... ..	36, 37
——— martyrdom of, in Bethlehem... ..	77
Christ, the Historic ... ..	4
Chronology... ..	5
Circus, Roman, games in ... ..	46
Circumcision allowed on Sabbath ... ..	106
Clients, Roman ... ..	41
Colonies, Roman ... ..	13, 15
Commerce in Roman Empire ... ..	15
Confession of faith, Jewish ... ..	108
Constantine ... ..	90
Coponius ... ..	80
Costobarus ... ..	73
Council in Alexandria ... ..	170
Cyprus, Jewish rebellion in .. ..	89
Cyrene, ditto .. ..	89
Cyrene, Jews in ... ..	167
Cyrenius (or Quirinus) ... ..	6, 81

	PAGE
Damascus, synagogues in	165
Daniel, Book of	149, 150
Date of the birth of Christ	5
Dionysius Exiguus	5
Dispersion, Jewish	163
Domestic Life among the Gentiles	33
Education of the young in Palestine	124—126, 172
Egypt, Jews in	169
Emmaus	59
Emperors, Roman, deification of	22, 23
Empire, Roman	11
Enoch, Book of	152
Epicureanism	27
Essenes, origin of	140
——— doctrines of	141
——— localities of	142
——— manner of life of	143, 144
Ethnarch, Jewish, in Alexandria	170
Expectation of a deliverer from the east	31
Ezra, fourth book of	156
Family Life, Gentile	33
Fasting	109
Felix, Antonius, procurator	86
Festus, Porcius, procurator	86
Festivals, Jewish, journeyings of the people to	60
Fides	21
Freedmen	40
Galilee, Upper, physical formation of	64
——— Lower, ditto	64, 65
——— government of	65
——— population of	65
Galileans, character of	65, 66
Gamaliel, the Scribe	104, 105

	PAGE
Games, Roman ... ..	46
Gaulonitis ... ..	67, 82, 83
Gemara, the ... ..	103
Geography of Palestine ... ..	49
Gerizim, temple at .. ..	62
Gessius Florus, procurator ... ..	87
Greece, Jews in ... ..	167
Greek language ... ..	13, 14
Hadrian ... ..	89
Haggada, the ... ..	102
Halacha, the ... ..	102
Hall of Squares ... ..	93
Haphtarah, the ... ..	122
Heathendom in Our Lord's time ... ..	10
Heathenism, defects of .. ..	28
Hebrew language ... ..	53
Hellenism ... ..	174, 175
Here[... ..	20
Herod Agrippa I. ... ..	85, 86
Herod Agrippa II. ... ..	86
Herod Antipas ... ..	83—85
Herod the Great ... ..	71—79
——— his crimes ... ..	72, 73, 77
——— favoured by Octavius ... ..	74
——— architectural works of ... ..	74
——— conspiracies against ... ..	76
——— death of ... ..	78
——— character of ... ..	78, 79
——— testament of ... ..	79
Herod Philip, the tetrarch ... ..	82
Herod Philip ... ..	84
Herodians, the ... ..	84, 135
Herodias ... ..	84
High Council (see Sanhedrin)	



	PAGE
High Priest, functions of...	95
Hillel, the Scribe ...	103
Hyrcanus, John ...	69
Hyrcanus II. ...	70
Idumea, conquered by Jews ...	69
Idumean, Antipater, the...	70, 71
Indra ...	18
Italy, Jews in ..	167
Iturea ...	67, 82, 83
Izates, king, a proselyte...	164
James the elder, death of ...	86
Jason of Cyrene ...	168
Jericho ...	59
Jerusalem, situation of ...	56
————— splendid buildings in ...	57, 58
————— aspects of streets in ...	59
————— siege and destruction of ...	88
Jewish history ...	68—90
Jewish people, mixed character of ...	53
Jews in the dispersion ...	163
John Hyrcanus ...	69
John of Giscala ...	88
John the Baptist ...	8, 84
Jonathan, Targum of ...	153
Joseph Caiaphas, the High Priest ...	96
Josephus, silence of, about the Messiah (see Note 6) ...	155
Jubilees, Book of ...	103, 154
Judaism in the time of Jesus ...	49
Judas Maccabeus ...	69
Judæa, province of ...	56
Juno ...	21
Jupiter Capitolinus ...	22
Jurisdiction, Jewish, in Palestin ...	95
Jurisdiction, Jewish, in Alexandria ...	170

	PAGE
Labour, estimation of, by Jews ... ..	60
Land and people of Israel, the ... ..	49
Language, Greek ... ..	13, 14
——— Latin ... ..	13
——— spoken in Palestine ... ..	53, 122
Law of Moses, the ... ..	98
Law, Roman ... ..	13
Leontopolis, temple in ... ..	170
Lessons in the Synagogue ... ..	122
Libertines ... ..	167
Life, domestic, in the Roman Empire... ..	33
Literature, Jewish, in the dispersion ... ..	174
——— heathen ... ..	36
Logos, The ... ..	179
Luxury, heathen ... ..	43
Maccabees, the ... ..	69
Machærus, fortress of ... ..	67, 84
Magi, the ... ..	6
Mars ... ..	22
Marcellus, the procurator ... ..	80
Marcus Ambivius, procurator ... ..	80
Mariamne ... ..	72, 73
Marullus, procurator ... ..	80
Mattathias Maccabeus ... ..	69
Media, Jews in ... ..	164
Messiah, prophecies of, in Old Testament ... ..	148
——— ——— ——— apocalyptic books ... ..	149, 151
——— Philo's doctrine of the ... ..	180
——— Christ the true ... ..	162
Messianic hope, the ... ..	147
Mesopotamia, Jews in ... ..	164
Mesusa, the ... ..	108
Middle class among the Gentiles ... ..	41
Midrashim ... ..	103
Mishna, the ... ..	102



	PAGE
Philip, Herod, the tetrarch ... ..	82
Philip, husband of Herodias ... ..	84
Philo, doctrines and views of ... ..	177
Philosophers, heathen, doctrines of ... ..	27
Philosophy among the Hellenistic Jews ... ..	175
Phylacteries ... ..	108
Pilate, Pontius ... ..	81
Plays, Roman ... ..	36, 45
Politics of Palestine ... ..	68
Pompeii ... ..	44
Pompey, conquest of Jerusalem by ... ..	70
Porcius Festus, the procurator ... ..	86
Prætorium ... ..	58
Prayers, heathen ... ..	29
Prayer, places for, by river-sides ... ..	120, 172
Prayers, Jewish ... ..	108
Priesthood, Jewish ... ..	116
Procurators ... ..	80, 86
Proselytes ... ..	185
—— baptism of ... ..	186
Psalter of Solomon .. ..	152
Ptolemies, rule of, over Palestine .. ..	68
Ptolemy VI. (Philometor) ... ..	170
Purifications, Jewish ... ..	107
Pythagoreanism ... ..	141
Quirinus (or Cyrenius) .. ..	6, 81
Rabbis .. ..	100, 101
Rebellion of the Jews against Rome ... ..	87
Religions of the East ... ..	18, 19
Religion in Greece ... ..	20
—— in Rome... ..	21
—— among the Jews .. ..	112—128
Roman empire, extent of ... ..	11



	PAGE
Simon Maccabeus...	69
Siva	18
Slavery in Roman Empire	38—40
Spain, Jews in	167
Spectacular plays	36, 45
Star of Bethlehem	6
Stoicism	27
Synagogue, objects of	120
———— in Jerusalem	120
———— interior arrangements of	121
———— management of	121
———— services in	122
Syria, Jews in	165
Talmud	102
‘Taxing,’ the, or Census	6, 81
Temple, description of	113, 114
———— rebuilt	75, 112—114
———— revenues of	60, 128, 164
———— services in	117
———— situation of	112
———— Jewish, in Egypt	170
Tephillin	108
Terminus	21
Theatre, Roman	45
Therapeutæ	141, 142, 181
Tithes	107
Titus, Roman General	88
Toleration in the Empire	24
Trachonitis...	67, 82, 83
Trade Associations, Jewish	60
Trajan	89
Union of Peoples	10
Valerius Gratus	80











DATE DUE

A 50.0

MAY 12 1962

PRINTED IN U.S.A.





BW970 .S45  
In the time of Jesus: historical

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00030 9973